Shakespearean Lives and Works

Sean B. Palmer

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Sussex

November 2013

For Miranda Bless

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

SEAN B. PALMER, FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SHAKESPEAREAN LIVES AND WORKS

SUMMARY

This is a chronology of Shakespeare and his family from 1530 to 1623, collecting key dateable events from the documentary records associated with the subjects in this period. Annotations are provided in extensive detail to explain the issues surrounding the documents used, establishing their provenances, exploring problematic features, and situating the records relative to one another and the wider cultural background.

One of the primary contributions of the study is a new integrated analysis of the dates of Shakespeare's plays, helping to understand the nature of his creative development. Other prominent findings surround evidence for the date of Shakespeare's birth which has previously eluded attention, and the authorship of the *Poetical Essays* appended to a work by Robert Chester. Analyses of the implications of Chettle's authorship in a *Groatsworth of Wit*, and of early modern "game" terminology, further indicate the diversity of subjects covered.

Due to the complex use of multiple layers of documentary evidence, the study has been constructed using methods which focus on the dependencies between information and the balance of probabilities amongst alternative theories. Some of these methods are taken from a blend of disciplines, building on the author's previous work in cognitive science and the philosophy of creativity. The aim has been to facilitate the endeavour engaged in by Edmond Malone, to have "every obscurity elucidated."

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis has not been, and will not be, submitted in whole or in part to another university for the award of any other degree.

Signature: .....

Acknowledgements

Terje Bless engaged warmly with this work. He understood the direction that I was taking from the very start, gave encouragement, and was always happy to discuss ideas. Without Terje's confidence in my work, and without his support when producing this research, the results would be by far the poorer. This work is dedicated to Terje's first daughter.

Nick Darton and Andrew Hadfield provided different but complementary kinds of assistance. Nick made sure as much as possible that my welfare and administrative needs were met. He has also been a great friend, and given a style of support at which he is remarkably skilled. Andrew has made sure as much as possible that my academic needs were met, especially in opening the door to perform this research in the first place. He trusted that I would produce work of a high standard, and I hope that this work is an adequate response to that trust.

Kerith Harris, John Terrill, and many others working behind the scenes, have been instrumental in helping me through my academic career. It is no exaggeration to say that without them, I could not have done this work; I literally owe the fact that I have been able to produce this work to them. I cannot thank them enough.

The Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Records Office have supplied material that has helped me to solve or further several mysteries, and the British Library and Folger Library provided useful assistance. Scholars Stephen Greenblatt and Joseph Pearce were most kind in correspondence, helping an unknown scholar with minute and pedantic questions, taking time from their busy schedules to assist someone with their research. My acknowledgement of these organisations and people does not imply their endorsement of any aspect of my work.

Of my friends, I'd like to thank Stuart Woodhall and Noah Slater for their support. The interest they have shown in all my projects is most appreciated. I'd also like to thank my family for their support, especially my mother Stella, and my aunt Pam.

Table of contents

Introduction and Methods

Shakespearean Chronology, 1530 to 1623

Bibliography of Sources

Years by page

Introduction and Methods

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

There are many encyclopædic works available on Shakespearean subjects, and some of these form the genre of companions. Examples include Halliday's *A Shakespeare Companion* (1952) and the Oxford *Companion to Shakespeare* (2008). These aim to document a wide range of Shakespearean subjects in alphabetical order, for ease of consultation and for general reference. Although companions have proved popular, it is surprising that there should be fewer works in some related genres. The present work is in the form of a chronology, which shares some characteristics with companions. Since there are fewer chronologies than there are companions, a brief introduction to chronology as a genre with reference to companions may prove helpful.

1.2. Chronology as a genre

The most obvious difference between companion and chronology is that a chronology arranges its entries not alphabetically, but by dates. These entries may not always have an exact date associated with them, as it is not possible to date all events precisely. Arrangement by date makes it more difficult to consult a particular subject by name. Entries about the Lord Chamberlain's Men, for example, will be spread out in a chronology between 1594 and 1603, whereas in a companion they would be collected under a single heading. On the other hand, a benefit of the chronological approach is that it provides a more faithful representation of the target period as it unfolded. A chronology may allow the reader to notice more obviously, for example, that Shakespeare bought New Place only eleven days after his patron was installed into the Order of the Garter. Associations between events due to their point of occurrence can easily be overlooked in topic driven companions; they can also be overlooked by authors of narrative works.

A further difference between the two genres is that the nature of their topics will necessarily diverge. A companion could, for example, discuss attitudes to Catholicism under a heading of the same name, whereas in a chronology such discussion would have to be associated with specific events involving Catholicism, such as the discovery of John Shakespeare's spiritual will. This means that chronology precludes some kinds of analysis, because it lacks a framework for organising discussion around certain topics. The lack of such a framework is not a disadvantage, but shifts the focus of work and forces the scholar to concentrate instead on subjects associable with a date. Evidence for dates is derived primarily from documentary records. Since this evidence is often ambiguous or circumstantial, further insight and analysis is necessary, ranging from knowledge of watermarks to archaic euphemisms for medical conditions. The threads between the various *kinds* of documentation available for deriving dates are what give the chronology its recognisable literary cohesion.

There are several advantages to restricting the scope of topics in a chronology to those associated with dateable documentary evidence. Foremost amongst these is that it discourages historical speculation. The evasion of speculation was one of the major reasons why respected 20th century Shakespearean scholar S. Schoenbaum chose to write a life of Shakespeare oriented towards documentary evidence, his *William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life* (1975). Another advantage of restricting the scope in this way is that it provides a uniquely characteristic landscape of evidence to explore. Though it involves challenges too, this means that documentary evidence, in the sense used here, usually belongs to one of a small set of types. One common type of evidence is the administrative record. The fact that these records are common shows that one of the primary reactive instincts to important events is to record when they happened.

Though the common availability of administrative records makes composing a chronology straightforward from a structural point of view, it does not follow that a chronology is a straightforward work. Administrative records often hide layers of immense complexity. Marriages, for example, are difficult to research. One may use them as the starting point of an investigation into issues such as the relationships between the two families whose members are getting married. These kinds of

investigations range from generic to specific: generic kinds include research into existing practices regarding the act of marriage, and specific kinds include researching the possible venues of a particular marriage ceremony. Some of these issues become increasingly complex in proportion to the amount of research effort invested in them. The elucidation of issues such as these is what forms the majority of the research findings of the present work.

As well as the potential complexity of the evidence, it is important to emphasise the fundamental diversity of the work. This arises from another important characteristic of a chronology due to its basis on documentary evidence: the evidence leads the scholar. If there are many records about land purchases but very few about civic duties, for example, then the scholar must necessarily investigate the land purchases more frequently. The evidence sets the agenda. A corollary to this is that sometimes unique and unusual fields of research will be encountered. The questions surrounding the illicit trading of wool, a practice known as brogging, is a notable example. We know this practice to have been engaged in by John Shakespeare, and a sound understanding of brogging is crucial to understanding possible solutions to the puzzles surrounding John's financial circumstances.

In conclusion, such diversity helps to keep a chronology tightly bound to the lives of its subjects. The subjects, seen through the lens of the methods appropriate to conducting research for a chronology, will entice us to observe the paths they walked, helping us to remember their preoccupations. This work is entitled *Shakespearean Lives and Works* because it represents the dichotomy between the subjects and our means of understanding them. The subjects are the *lives* of Shakespeare and his cohorts, and our means for understanding them are the many *works* that we have available—including plays and administrative records, the efforts of other scholars, and more.

1.3 Significance of this work

This chronology makes two major contributions. First, it collects together evidence, suggestions, and interpretations from a wide range of sources into a single reference work. This information cannot be consulted in any other single work, and would

instead require the consultation of hundreds of disparate sources. The collection process also required a new evaluation of the information, and produced a work which stands apart in unifying so many results in a chronological format.

Second, it builds on the collected information and provides extensive commentary. These commentaries offer fresh insights into the problems at hand. Some of these insights concern dates, such as the arguments for the birth years of Shakespeare's parents, or the carefully constructed cases for accurately dating Shakespearean works. But many concentrate on solving key questions, such as which companies Shakespeare is likely to have been with before the Lord Chamberlain's Men, or the circumstances behind the earliest printed allusion to Shakespeare in the *Groatsworth of Wit*. These results ultimately provide a new understanding of Shakespeare's life.

2. Methods and results

2.1. Event selection criteria

The rules for determining whether an event should be included as a dated entry within this work are known as *event selection criteria*. The core motivation behind them was to consider what categories, what kinds of event, would best shape the work. Shaping the work is essential to give it cohesion, ensuring that selected events are related to one another and to the subjects of research chosen; and to give it direction, ensuring that work is conducted in areas which are valuable to research. It also helps to keep the work focussed.

The most important events are those connected with Shakespeare's work. The plays and poems are the reason why Shakespeare is studied at all. These events are therefore given significant weight not only in terms of selection, but also in terms of depth of commentary. The initial date of composition for each play has been subjected to a new analysis, including the study of whether subsequent revisions affect the perceived date of composition. Since the plays were written in the context of the theatre, major events of theatrical life are also included. These include performances of plays by the companies that Shakespeare is known, or strongly suspected, to have been part of; and closures of the London theatres, which would have affected company touring schedules and finances.

Though Shakespeare attracts interest because of his plays, there is also noticeable interest in how he came to write those plays at all. To give a well-rounded account of Shakespeare, it is necessary to focus on the environment that somehow brought him to the stage. Not much is known about Shakespeare before he went to London—these are often referred to as the "Lost Years"—but there is documentary evidence about Shakespeare's family, especially his father John. Though Shakespeare's colleagues would also have been important in his life, the theatrical events selected already form the majority of the work. To provide balance, and to accommodate constraints on space, it is necessary to give particular focus to Shakespeare's family.

Research into Shakespeare's family informs us about conditions that would have been extremely familiar to Shakespeare. It tells us about the parents who raised him, and the children that he, in turn, raised. It also provides insight into the difficult questions pertaining to Shakespeare's artistic development. Would it not be interesting, for example, to discover why Shakespeare, out of all of his family, friends, and cohorts, became one of the most renowned figures in English literature? Why not his brother Gilbert? Why not his daughter Susanna? This question is likely never to be resolved to the full satisfaction of those asking it, but that does not mean that partial answers are not desirable.

Consider John Shakespeare as an example. His career shaped the wealth of the family that Shakespeare was born into, the ability for him to be sent to school, and his whole family life. The documentary evidence about John reveals a man deeply involved in community issues, who rose to positions of civil responsibilities but then succumbed to unexpected financial difficulty. Detailed analysis of these facts could be considered in comparison to Shakespeare's position in the community, and his observations on community within his work, linking the fields of research together. Or consider what we know about Shakespeare's progeny. The fact that his granddaughter Elizabeth was able to go to London as a teenager, for example, tells us that his daughters Susanna and Judith may have also visited Shakespeare in London at a similar age; a suggestion which has not received attention outside of the present work. But to be able to consider these things, the documentary evidence needs first to be evaluated. The aim of the present work is to perform some of this evaluation, assisting others in such considerations. Evaluating the evidence regarding Shakespeare's family sets a strong foundation for subsequent research.

The third major category of events to be included are allusions, and reactions, to Shakespeare. Allusions are divided into literary allusions, which are references to Shakespeare as a literary professional; and personal allusions, such as records of law suits in which Shakespeare was involved.

Literary allusions are valuable for many reasons. They help to understand how Shakespeare was viewed by his cohorts, in terms of how widely he was known, which

of his works were most popular, and which issues and ideas Shakespeare was known for. They give us a sense of how Shakespeare fits into the literary-intellectual environment of the Eliza-Jacobean ages. Personal events, on the other hand, are a mixture of administrative matters, slurs against Shakespeare's character, meetings recorded by his kinsmen, and many other kinds of diverse material. The heterogeneity of the personal events can be difficult to make sense of, but is a characteristic of the original documentary evidence that cannot be explained away, glossed over, or otherwise eliminated. The records do not provide as full and complete an account of Shakespeare's life as may be desired. We receive only fragments, and our understanding of Shakespeare's life has significant lacunae as a result. What material there is must be carefully studied.

There are therefore three major kinds of event covered in this work: professional, family, and allusions. Professional events are further subdivided into career events, pertaining to the plays and poems, and theatre events. Allusions are further subdivided into literary allusions (called "allusions" in the list below), and personal allusions, which cover a wide range of heterogenous events.

On these bases, events counted as individual units, rather than by the word count of the commentaries on the events, are proportioned as follows:

- Career, 40%
- Family, 27%
- Allusions, 10%
- Personal, 10%
- Theatre, 8%
- Other, 5%

All percentages are approximate. Because this metric only corresponds to event selection, it does not necessarily give a proportionate indication of the amount of commentary that event types receive in the work. Approximately 15% of the work by word count, for example, is concerned with events involving Shakespeare's family, compared to 27% by event count. The "other" event category includes those events

which do not form part of any of the other major categories but were still judged to be important to include in the work for a number of reasons. Examples of events that require further justification due to not being contained within the preceding categories include:

- 28th November 1576 and 31st May 1577 events connected to brogging. These events help to contextualise the activities of John Shakespeare, showing how current events affecting his trade interleave with his known financial circumstances.
- 4th November 1584 death of Charles Borromeo. This sets a *terminus ad quem*, the latest possible date, for the authorship of the *Spiritual Last Will and Testament* probably signed by John Shakespeare and hidden in the rafters of his home. There is no other possible date to which this could be affixed, so the *terminus ad quem* had to be used in this instance.
- 3rd September 1592 death of Robert Greene. This event contextualises the subsequent events in the text concerning the first printed reference to Shakespeare, and the *Groatsworth of Wit* saga.
- 30th May 1593 murder of Christopher Marlowe. Shakespeare referred to this murder three times in his plays, and quoted a line from Marlowe in *As You Like It*. It is reasonable to infer from this evidence, and the fact that Shakespeare had written *Venus and Adonis* in parallel to Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, that the death of Marlowe was of considerable significance to Shakespeare.
- 8th February 1601, 19th February 1601, and 25th February 1601 events related to the Essex rebellion. The Lord Chamberlain's Men were interrogated as part of the aftermath of the rebellion, and the inclusion of these events helps to contextualise, for example, the performance in front of the queen by the Lord Chamberlain's Men on 24th February 1601, the day before Essex was executed.
- 24th March 1603, 5th April 1603, 28th April 1603, and 25th July 1603 events related to the death of Elizabeth I and the accession of James I. The justification for the inclusion of these events is given in detail below.
- 30th October 1606 death of Mary Mountjoy. Shakespeare had resided with the Mountjoy family a few years earlier, and there is a reasonable possibility that her

burial would have come at a time when Shakespeare was still within the family's social circle.

The death of Elizabeth I and the accession of James I are included, but not the deaths or accessions of any of the other monarchs within the time period. Elizabeth's death prompted the closure of the theatres, which had a direct impact on Shakespeare's profession. Shakespeare had also written plays that were performed for Elizabeth, and had probably himself acted in at least some of these performances. There is also a plausible but unverified story that Elizabeth commanded Shakespeare to write the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Elizabeth, therefore, was an important figure in Shakespeare's career and life, in a way that no monarch before her was. Previous monarchs are redundant; beyond the threshold for relevance within this work. James, similarly, was not just a monarch: he was also Shakespeare's patron, and the King's Men were for example given livery cloth for James's entrance into London. There is also the unverified story told by Lady Herbert in 1865 that James was told that Shakespeare was at Wilton House,[1] and that James therefore attended. James was the last monarch alive in Shakespeare's lifetime, but Charles I's queen consort visited New Place long after Shakespeare's death, which affected his family; and on the day of his coronation Charles I offered Dr John Hall a knighthood, which Hall refused. The coronation of Charles I and the offer of a knighthood are also, therefore, recorded within the chronology.

Stratford baptisms, burials, and marriages have been cross-checked between the list given in Chambers, and that given by Blakemore Evans and Tobin in *Records, Documents, and Allusions*. The latter only ever omits those given by Chambers. Some are apparently omitted due to lack of relevance, for example the births of the children of John Shakespeare the corvizer; and some are apparently omitted as they fall outside the range that Blakemore Evans and Tobin decided to cover, for example the marriage of Thomas Nash and Elizabeth Hall in 1626. Other omissions are not so easy to explain. The baptism in 1603 of Mary Hart, daughter to Shakespeare's sister and her husband William Hart, for example, is included by Blakemore Evans and Tobin. Her burial on 17th December 1607, on the other hand, is not. Chambers has therefore been followed in the present work, excepting that certain logical omissions as in Blakemore

Evans and Tobin have been followed: references to Elizabeth Shakespeare (b. 1584 to Anthony Shakespeare), and all of the family of John Shakespeare the corvizer, have been omitted. The baptisms of Thomas Quiney and Thomas Nash are, however, included; as are the burials of Thomas Green alias Shakespeare and Mary Hart. Only one of these inclusions has a non-obvious rationale: that of the burial of Thomas Green alias Shakespeare. Thomas Greene is also the name of the town clerk who stayed with the Shakespeare family at New Place, and described himself as a cousin of Shakespeare. The exact family link between this Thomas Greene and Shakespeare is still unclear, though a 1940s study establishes the likelihood of such a link.[2] The existence of an earlier Thomas Green alias Shakespeare seems very likely, therefore, to refer to a member of both the relevant Shakespeare and Green/Greene families, warranting inclusion in the chronology.

It is important also to note that while Chambers and Blakemore Evans & Tobin categorise these events by locality and type of record in addition to chronological order, the present work only preserves chronological order. This helps to remove some inconsistencies. For example, Chambers is able due to his categorisation to record the baptisms of both Thomas Quiney and Thomas Nash, who married one of Shakespeare's daughters and his only granddaughter respectively; yet the same scheme prevents him in two ways from mentioning the birth of John Hall, who married Shakespeare's other daughter. The first way is that John Hall was not born in any of the record areas that Chambers covers. The second is that the record of his baptism has not survived anyway, and his year of birth must be deduced from the age he gives for himself in his casebooks.

All allusions to Shakespeare by name, initials, or other clear references to him as a person—such as that by Thomas Heywood in 1612, to someone "much offended with M. Jaggard"—are included, up to the end of the range covered by this work. Most of the multitude of allusions solely to Shakespeare's work within and after his lifetime are not included as separate entries within this chronology, but some are referred to within the textual commentaries where such references have been necessary e.g. for the dating of a work. In order to date most plays, for example, the

earliest allusions to the plays are often considered within the commentaries for the play involved. The exceptions to this criterion for allusion entries are:

1. Henry Peacham's manuscript of a performance of Titus Andronicus in 1594
2. William Scott's critical essay on two of Shakespeare's works in 1599
3. Letters by the Earl and Countess of of Southampton in 1599 probably referring to Shakespearean characters
4. Queen Elizabeth's mention of performances of *Richard II* in 1601

Exceptions 1 and 2 were included due to their significance as the first detailed records of Shakespearean works in performance and as objects of literary-critical merit. Exceptions 3 and 4 were included due to their social relevance to Shakespeare and the Essex plot in which the Lord Chamberlain's Men were interrogated for possible implication.

2.2. Choice of date range

All works that cover events connected to Shakespeare must choose a range within which dates are chosen. There are many sensible possibilities for the choice of date range, including but not limited to:

1. The birth and death of Shakespeare
2. The first and last known dates on which Shakespeare was engaged in his theatrical career
3. The birth of one of his ancestors to the death of his spouse, one of his siblings, or one of his descendants
4. The entire 16th and 17th centuries
5. The accession of Elizabeth I and the death of James I

Scholarly treatment of range varies. The *Dictionary of Literary Biography* covers records of Shakespeare from his birth to his death, but arbitrarily divides these sections into "Baptism through the 'Lost Years'" (1564–1591), "The Elizabethan Years" (1592–1603) despite the fact that Elizabeth was already on the throne when

Shakespeare was born, and "The Jacobean Years" (1603–1616). Sometimes eminent scholars choose date ranges which they do not defend, and which have no discernible logic behind them. *Records, Documents, and Allusions* by Blakemore Evans and Tobin, for example, only gives "Life Records" between 1558 and 1623; this is most likely from the birth of Shakespeare's oldest sibling to the death of his spouse, but this is neither confirmed nor given any other reasonable explanation. Similarly, the last "Contemporary Allusion" to Shakespeare included by Chambers in *Facts and Problems* is the 1640 epistle to the *Poems* by John Benson. Chambers says that he has limited himself to "passages which make some personal reference to Shakespeare", but Benson only began his career in the 1630s and is unlikely to have actually met Shakespeare unless he was extremely young at the time. Benson's epistle does sound personal, but it was probably through report that he was able to learn about Shakespeare in that way. On the other hand, information collected on report by Aubrey is not included in the Contemporary Allusions section. Chambers gives no reason for extending the date of contemporary allusions to 1640.

The present chronology contains entries from the period 1530 to 1623 inclusive, following possibility three given in the list of example ranges above, and following a similar model to that most likely chosen by Blakemore Evans and Tobin. It uses the limits established by the birth of Shakespeare's oldest parent, and the death of his spouse. There are several reasons for this choice. One is to allow the implementation of the philosophy established and justified in the previous section: the period 1530 to 1623 includes many events connected with Shakespeare's family, the coverage of which leads to the benefits already noted. In terms of the coverage of publications, 1623 also marks a turning point in that it is the publication year of the First Folio, the first comprehensive collection aiming to preserve all of Shakespeare's works. Quarto texts up until 1623 are useful sources, ending with the first quarto (Q1) of *Othello* in 1622. The First Folio has such weight amongst Shakespearean textual studies that the landscape after it is irrevocably changed. Using a date range to 1623 allows for the coverage of all of the Shakespearean publications up to and including the publication of the First Folio.

Performances of Shakespearean plays continued after his death, halting only for the interregnum, continuing through to the present day. It is necessary therefore to choose an arbitrary latest date for included performances: the closing of the theatres around the start of the interregnum is perhaps the most reasonable choice, but using 1623 as the limit for the present work does not significantly impact the coverage due to the otherwise continuous range of performances. Allusions to Shakespeare, likewise, continue long after his death. Chambers lists personal allusions up to 1640, but the last personal allusion by somebody who can strongly be claimed to have met Shakespeare is that by Sir William Davenant in 1638. There are only four personal allusions listed by Chambers after 1623. The first of Chambers's entries for the Shakespearean "mythos", on the other hand, starts at c.1625. Arguably, the mythos started earlier: *Willobie his Avisa* (1594) and John Manningham's diary entry about the William the Conqueror anecdote (1602) could be considered mythos, but the opinion of Chambers was otherwise. The start of the mythos in c.1625 provides a good counterpart to coverage of non-mythos up to 1623.

2.3. Dating the plays

This study contains the first comprehensive chronological analysis of the plays of Shakespeare since the Oxford *Complete Works of Shakespeare* (2005, 2nd edition). In the period since that work went to press, there have been some individual editions of the plays published which often contain excellent introductory matter. One of the primary subjects of the introductory matter is the date of the introduced play, to orient the reader about its creation. The quality of such recent introductions has been high. Despite this, there is a history of skepticism about the process of dating the plays. Scholars can be unwilling to accept anything more than broad dates, and traditionally the task has been deemed difficult, perhaps even futile, with unstable results. One of the primary discoveries made during the course of the present study is that this attitude is unwarranted, because there is a greater consensus about the dates of the plays than would seem to be acknowledged. A review of arguments presented herein for the dates of Shakespearean plays shows that the majority have dates which are acceptable to a high degree of precision, usually to within a single year, and that sometimes these have already been accepted for many years. Often these stable dates

are bolstered by the most recent and respected research in the individual editions of the plays. The present work builds on all of this, and further reinforces such stability.

Why does some skepticism still persist? One straightforward reason is that a few of the plays are still difficult to date. The *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *All's Well That Ends Well*, for example, have far below the average amount of evidence that we have to base the dates of plays on. Even in these cases, however, it is possible to make some effort to date them. They are dateable to at least distinct periods of Shakespeare's creative development, so that even here the case is not as bad as it could be.

The primary reason behind the myth of difficult dating, however, is the isolated nature of research into dating. Investigating the dates of all the plays simultaneously has many benefits that investigating a single play by itself does not. Not only can techniques for such research be honed and reused many times over, but patterns may be noticed between plays that would not be obvious from analysis of a single play. Even more appropriately in the context of a chronology that has a wider remit of subjects than just the plays, it becomes possible to notice where patterns of writing and other events possibly coincide. The inaccessibility of the Theatre playhouse in London to the Lord Chamberlain's Men in 1598, for example, coincides with an apparent lull in creative output from Shakespeare. Are these events related? They may not be, but such parallels are worth noting, at least for the purpose of future research. They may even influence the present research, when the probabilities of the findings are strong.

One of the most useful consequences of a wider view of chronology for dating the plays is understanding the overall rate of play production. From researching only the most reliably dated plays first, it became apparent that Shakespeare most likely did not write plays simultaneously. Some of the argument behind this can be found in the annotations under c.1590, the start of Shakespeare's career as an individual playwright, and some of his early plays including *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Titus Andronicus*. Such results are closely related to the question of how Shakespeare's creativity developed through his career. Tentative answers to this question are one of

the primary features surrounding the work on dating the plays, outside the core of establishing the dates of creation.

2.4. Verifying evidence

The majority of works consulted as sources contain a lower density of references than the present study, which aims to give a source for every substantive fact or interpretation used, for the purposes of verification. As a yardstick of comparison, Mark Eccles produced a book with one of the highest reference densities amongst any of the present sources, *Shakespeare in Warwickshire* (1963). Though no quantitative comparison has been made of the reference densities, this may be one of the few works to exceed the present work in this respect. The references in Eccles are, however, difficult to follow due to their being collected per paragraph rather than per fact. This means that there is a indexical marker only at the end of each paragraph, even if there are a dozen facts in the paragraph. The reader has then to match each fact against each severely abbreviated reference in the endnotes at the back of the book. This is not always easy, and it obviates the very process which such notes are supposed to facilitate. Three guidelines are followed in the present work to avoid problems of this nature: (1) Individual footnotes with an indexical marker are used after each individual fact. (2) The footnote entries come directly after the sections that they appear in, so that they are section-footnotes, neither endnotes nor page-footnotes. (3) Footnotes are not abbreviated, except for a handful of the most common sources.

Since a high density of references is unusual even amongst scholarly works, it may be deemed useful to illustrate the advantages of such a system. The entry for April 1569 in this study, which describes Shakespeare starting at petty school, is a simple example, but useful for exposition of the principle. On researching when Shakespeare may have gone to school, I found that one author stated that he started school at the age of four. Two other authors said that he started school at either age four or age five. Three others said that he started at age five. Out of these six authors, none of them provided a source for their information on this point. It would have been possible for me to check only those three works where Shakespeare is said to have started school

at the age of five. If I had done so I may have concluded, it would seem reasonably, that Shakespeare had started school at the age of five, because three scholars in the field stated this. Researching widely allowed me to notice the discrepancy, but often the available sources for a certain fact are more limited than in this case. The implication is clear: evidence must be verified directly. Providing a source reference for facts is one of the easiest ways of facilitating such verification.

I research widely around a problem not primarily to spot divergent opinions, but to collect as much data on an issue as possible. The act of verification, in other words, is a separate mechanism to the act of collecting evidence. In the case of Shakespeare going to school, since I found the discrepancy, and since I was unable to verify any of the data, I had to consult primary sources myself. I did not find much information from primary sources, unfortunately, and this question is still open for further research. But I was able to develop a more obviously well researched answer than my sources. This is not to say that my sources on this issue did not engage in a similar or even greater level of research to me; just that since none of them recorded that they did so, this forced me into doing further research myself. Unfortunately, researchers always have more potential research leads than they are able to follow. This means that they must rely on shades of reliability, and it would be untenable to advocate against researchers publishing, for example, their tentative conclusions. Some of the methods developed for this work may, however, be reusable for solving problems common to the pattern described above.

To conclude, a high density of references is desirable from several perspectives. It allows the reader to check the form of the referenced data. A quote may have been quoted wrong, for example, or an interpretation may be summarised in a misleading way, which is resolvable only when the source is known. It also allows the reader to refer to further contextual information. This does not refer only to the context in which the source placed the referenced material, but also wider context such as the credibility of the author in whose work the material appeared. There are also limitations to this system. If the parent source obtained their information from a grandparent source, which is often the case for substantive facts such as documentary quotes from primary sources, and thankfully less common for interpretations of data,

then it requires the parent source to have made a reference too in order to be of further use. Certainly such a reference to the parent source is still useful for, say, checking that the form of a quote is preserved correctly between the present work and its parent source. But it is not useful for checking even the correctness of quotes if it is impossible to compare it with the primary source. Sometimes such issues become very complex, as in the case of the handwriting of Thomas Greene, who lived with the Shakespeare family at New Place, which is so difficult to read that even experienced palæographers find it problematic. In such cases, access to a primary source is not enough, and the act of verification is much harder. To work around such limitations, I have also employed common strategies such as cross-referencing. In general, my work on verification should be considered as a step towards better practice in this regard, not a completed process.

2.5. Probability nomenclature

Great care has been taken in this study regarding the terminology of probabilities. There is an important distinction made, especially, for the highest probability amongst alternatives. It is important not to conflate highest with high probabilities. The difference between the common adjective, "high", and the superlative, "highest" is more substantial than it may appear. On the quantitative scale between 0 and 1 for example, the probability of an event being high means it tends towards the 1 end of the spectrum. On the other hand, when something is described as being of the highest probability, that does not necessarily mean that it tends towards the 1 end at all, i.e. what would be described in prose as certain. In fact, in Shakespearean research the opposite is very often the case. Highest only means that it is higher than all the alternatives.

To reframe this point, researching Shakespearean issues often yields a number of plausible models which have a low probability. It is sometimes desirable to determine which of these low probability models have the highest probability. They are all unlikely, but one of them may be more likely than the others. To describe such a model as being of the highest probability amongst the alternatives is an accurate form of description. It is, in other words, the highest low probability model.

It is important also to note that evidence usually cannot be weighed with quantitative probabilities; that this is just an exegetic device. The same problem still holds for the assessment of qualitative probabilities. It must also be acknowledged that sometimes the probabilities between alternatives may not even have the property of transitivity, though this is a complex area of research, and outside the remit of this introduction. It is worth noting that the determination of highest probabilities amongst alternatives is a common feature of the present work, and should not be misconstrued or misrepresented as either speculation or inflated probability assignment.

3. Other methods

3.1. Treatment of authorial revision

Shakespeare revised some of his plays after they had already been performed: there is evidence for such revision, to varying degrees, for *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Titus Andronicus*, *1 and 2 Contention*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *Macbeth*.[3] Other plays were revised close to the time of editing and do not therefore affect chronology; these revisions are solely textual and theatrical issues. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* for example has interesting revisions to a speech made by Theseus, but Grace Ioppolo argues convincingly in her detailed study of revisions of Shakespearean plays that these were made close to the time of composition. *1 Henry IV* was revised due not to theatrical, but political requirements: naming the fat knight Oldcastle had caused offence with one of the Lords Cobham, and the knight was duly renamed to Falstaff.

It is important to emphasise that none of the revision work that Shakespeare is known to have carried out is substantive in terms of the number of lines changed, compared to the original work involved in writing a play. One of the most substantively revised works is *King Lear*, where the first folio (F1) has around 100 lines added and 300 lines removed compared to the quarto version.[4] This is in contrast with it being an over 3300 line play,[5] so only around 3% of the overall lines in F1 were added. Between the Q2 and F1 states of *Hamlet*, another of the largest known revisions, only 70 lines are added and nearly 220 removed—an addition equivalent to less than 2% of the number of lines in F1.[6] Even if such changes are seen as more substantive in terms of their theatrical impact than underlying statistics about line counts would suggest, it is clear that, as far as can be understood from existing texts, Shakespeare at no point invested anywhere near as much evident work into revising a play as he did in creating one.

In many cases, though the general activity of revision is possible to discern, what has actually been revised is much harder to discern due to one of the texts available for

comparison being corrupt: this is the case for *The Taming of the Shrew*, and *1 and 2 Contention*. The earlier text of *Romeo and Juliet* is also corrupt, but not to as great an extent as these other three plays. *Hamlet* is unique in having three divergent textual states, the earliest of which is considerably corrupt.

Boundaries for the dates of revision are usually established by the texts being compared. Because the revisions of plays are not proportionately extensive, dating revisions based on internal evidence ranges from extremely conjectural to outright impossible. Even in the case of *King Lear*, where the earlier version of the play was published towards the end of Shakespeare's writing career, leaving a short period amongst which scholars can aim their guesses, these guesses have been put into every part of the range: Halio says "after 1609" and later argues for "1611–12?", Wells says "probably in 1610", and Hornback believes 1613 is more likely. Such a scattered approach does not inspire confidence. It is not even entirely clear to what extent the *King Lear* revisions are by Shakespeare. Though it is widely accepted that the majority of changes are authorial, there are still dissenters both partial and full, such as Halio who thinks that the changes were likely "mixed and cumulative",[7] and Hornback with a minority position that Fletcher may have made them all.[8] *King Lear* contains some of the most substantive revisions known to have been made to any Shakespearean play. Since detailed attention has been paid to the nature of these changes over a number of decades, it is surprising that so little has been deduced from them.

If *King Lear* is a disheartening case from the perspective of assigning a date, *Othello* is even more so. Q1 of *Othello* was published in 1622, and the version in F1 published in 1623 contains 160 additional lines which appear to be predominantly authorial revisions. But there is no evidence at all, internal or external, to help date these lines. It is not even clear if the changes were made all at once or in stages. Since we can say that *Othello* was revised, we would like to be able to say when Shakespeare revised it, to help us to understand the changes in their myriad contexts—especially literary, theatrical, social, political, and cultural contexts. The effects that the changes have on the plays in performance have been strongly debated, and consensus on certain issues such as the strengthening of the role of Emilia in *Othello* has emerged. This has been a success of the revisionist scholarship. But the date or dates of most of the known

changes, which could be used to situate them within Shakespeare's artistic development as a whole, cannot be discerned. When there is no evidence, then there is nothing further that can be said.

Three of the more minor cases of revision, at least, do have clearer chronological bases than *King Lear* and *Othello*. Ioppolo argues that *Romeo and Juliet* was most plausibly revised between 1597, when Q1 was printed, and 1599, when Q2 was printed, since the "restoration of abridged passages to the prompt-copy after 1597 would have required some authorial reworking of the foul papers, and the recopying of the newly reworked foul papers into a prompt-copy could easily explain why the Chamberlain's Men released their original version to a printer in 1599."[9] It is not necessary that reworking foul papers into a prompt-copy would require authorial intervention—the Lord Chamberlain's Men could have used any competent writer, especially if Shakespeare were already busy with another text—but it is certainly the most attractive scenario. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* had its garter scenes removed after they were no longer topical, perhaps even immediately after the initial performance of the play in 1597, and at any rate quite soon since the only possible reason for their removal is their decrease in topicality. The removal of topical references in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is no cause for extended scholarly comment: the logic behind such changes is quite clear as a consequence of the original performance context of the play. This revision does not, in other words, warrant a separate entry because though the changes were not made immediately after composition, it was presumably intended during original composition that that these sections should be omitted as soon as was necessary. Contrast this to *King Lear*, for example, where the original play was written in 1605 and the authorial changes were made between 1609 and 1613 with much more intensely debated theatrical motivations. *Troilus and Cressida* was revised to take into account the War of the Theatres which raged in 1601, and may not even have been performed before that year despite the plausibility of it having been initially composed in c.1598.

Plays which were modified by Shakespeare before initial performance, or at least very close to the initial date of composition, obviously do not affect the dating evidence. They must, however, be shown to be early revisions rather than later ones. Some plays

were also modified in a manner that makes attribution difficult, but for which the consensus is that some revisions are authorial and some not. *Macbeth* is a good example: a number of cuts were made, whether by Shakespeare or by others is unknown; Hecate scenes were added, probably by Shakespeare after Simon Forman saw *Macbeth* at the Globe, since Forman did not note the Hecate scenes in an otherwise very detailed summary of the performance; and songs by Middleton at some point inserted, not by Shakespeare or Middleton.

Some critics have argued that, despite the attention paid to revision especially in the 1980s and 1990s, the questions surrounding revision are still not thoroughly integrated into contemporary discussion. In commenting on *Othello* in 1995, for example, the critic John Jones asked:

> Why, then, has it not long been well known, why is it not even now a commonplace and interesting subject for discussion, that Shakespeare revised this play? As always, the question is asked against a background blanket of unwillingness to believe that the child of nature returned to his work after he had, as he thought, finished it; and, as always, the particular case has special and technical aspects to it.[10]

The special and technical aspects must be further emphasised, because revisions to *King Lear* were certainly a commonplace and interesting subject for discussion in the 1980s and 1990s. This attention has now receded to an extent. It might be said that towards the end of the twentieth century, Shakespearean scholarship cast off the impression to which Jones refers—the "unwillingness to believe that the child of nature returned to his work"—and felt a new freedom in being able to discuss the possibility of authorial revision. But the light is always brightest when first emerging into it from darkness, and emerging from the darkness of disbelief about authorial revision initially made these revisions seem very bright. Now that due and proportionate attention is starting to be paid to them, the light appears normal and interest is seen to recede.

3.2. Secondary evidence

The requirement for a categorical division between primary and secondary sources is set out in the formal guidelines for doctoral theses to which the present work conforms. The criteria used to implement this division are, however, left to the individual researcher, and their choice must be explained.

The acceptance of the straightforward division of sources into "primary" and "secondary" has recently been in decline. This decline is reflected in the two editions of the work of one of its most prominent champions, Arthur Marwick. In the 1970 edition, *The Nature of History*, Marwick refers to the distinction between primary and secondary sources as being made at a "common-sense level", and one which is "obvious enough".[11] Gary McCulloch points out that in the 2001 edition (*The New Nature of History*) however, Marwick is forced to confront "growing skepticism about the distinction between primary and secondary sources in forceful fashion";[12] he does this by increasing his rhetoric, arguing that the "distinction between primary and secondary sources is absolutely explicit, and is not in the least bit treacherous and misleading". One of the dissenters to which Marwick had been responding was Hayden White in the *Journal of Contemporary History* in 1995, where the debate is characterised in terms of empirical, professional historical research (Marwick) against "structuralists, post-structuralists, cultural materialists, new historicists and metahistorians", which White takes to include himself.[13] McCulloch also dissents, and gives several examples of ambiguity between what is primary and what is secondary. Jenkins and Munslow point out a further problem with Marwick's philosophy in 2003:

> [W]hat determines interpretation ultimately lies beyond method and evidence in ideology. For while most historians would agree that a rigorous method is important, there is a problem as to which rigorous method they are talking about. In Marwick's own section on method he reviews a selection from which one can (presumably) choose. Thus, would you like to follow Hegel or Marx or Dilthey or Weber or Popper or Hempel or Aron or Collingwood or Dray or Oakeshoot or Danto or Gallie or Walsh or Atkinson

> or Leff or Hexter? Would you care to go along with modern empiricists, feminists, the Annales School, neo-Marxists, new-stylists, econometricians, structuralists or post-structuralists, or even Marwick himself, to name but twenty-five possibilities? And this is a short list! The point is that even if you could make a choice, what would be the criteria?[14]

The subtext is that data has to be interpreted to be used. Even Marwick appears to consider this common sense, by his very inclusion of a list of methods. But neither he, nor Jenkins and Munslow, follow these ideas to their logical conclusion: that since each school of interpretation is individual and characteristic, there is no historical analysis which is not shaped by a school of interpretation. An analogy may be made to quantum physics. A physical system, such as an electron, exists in a superposition of multiple simultaneous and undecided states called a *waveform* until it is measured. When it is measured, its waveform collapses to a more compact state. For example, simplifying heavily, an electron has no clear position until a positional measurement is made. The principle of quantum superposition is notoriously difficult to understand for students coming from a classical physics background. The same may be said of those students of history who arrive at the views of scholars such as White, McCulloch, Jenkins, and Marlow, from having been more familiar with the views of Marwick. Before a primary source is interpreted, its lack of interpretation can be seen as a superposition of potential states: the source is not situated within any specific school of thought. *The Taming of the Shrew* in its First Folio state, for example, is just a text. Though it is a primary source, without having been consulted by an historian it is yet to be given an interpretation. When scholars observe the text, the superposition collapses according to their interpretive school of thought. Feminist readings of *The Taming of the Shrew* will argue differently to, say, neo-Marxist readings.

In the most pessimistic of responses to Marwick's ideology, then, not only are the categories of "primary" and "secondary" sources subject to severe disintegrationism, but there is also no historical research independent of an individualising school of interpretation, meaning that no "primary" source can stand alone; no primary source even exists by itself (in this most pessimistic of readings), because once observed, the

nature of the text changes in accordance with the interpretation imposed by the observer.

The present work dispenses with both sides of the debate, and instead takes a staunchly practical, functionalist approach. This approach parallels the instrumentalist interpretation of quantum mechanics in the analogy with waveforms above. In the context of the present work, a primary source is defined as being any documentary material written within the date ranges covered, i.e. from 1530 to 1623 inclusive. Secondary sources are those which were written outside of this range. This distinction is, furthermore, made only within the bibliography. In other words, there is a tight coupling of the range of the chronology to the bibliographical categorisation. In the absence of existing terminology for this coupling, the blend "chronographical" shall be used.[15] All further references to primary and secondary sources are made solely in the chronographical sense.

With this chronographical categorisation, a majority of the references in the present work are to secondary sources. This work performs two tasks: it arranges events as chronological data points, and then provides analytical commentary on those events proportionate to weightings discussed in the selection of event criteria. This act of analytical commentary rejects the most pessimistic response to Marwick's ideology, that of many competing schools of thought where interpretation continues to multiply and no progress is made towards establishing facts and bases for evidence. It also rejects the strong version of the Marwick ideology itself, that primary sources have a sharply-defined, Aristotelian class of importance, with secondary evidence being an unfortunate path to disintegrationist late 20th century philosophy. The route chosen in this work is the *via media*: we can make progress in historical research, but only with a flexible appreciation of source material, taking into account as much as possible of the considerable research—that which Marwick would consider secondary—of many reputable scholars. This work concentrates on secondary sources, by analysis and contrast, and contributes its own conclusions.

Though the designations "primary" and "secondary" are used in this work, their use comes with many caveats to those who are familiar with them from any of the

ideologies mentioned above. These designations are not, for example, intended to homogenise the information they refer to, or to give an impression of characteristics that do not exist. The manuscript diary entry of John Manningham recording an anecdote about Burbage and Shakespeare, say, is to be treated differently to Shakespeare's last will and testament, even though they are both primary in the chronographical sense. This work accordingly does treat them differently: more weight is given to establishing the provenance and plausibility of the diary entry than of the last will and testament, which went through probate in 1616. Probate is a legal process designed to ensure the legal, not historical, validity of a document. This means that historical issues still remain—amongst these, the reference to Shakespeare's "second best bed" is well known regarding the will. But the challenges involved are different.

The same is true for secondary sources. Some historians, for example, are more reliable than others: Schoenbaum is more reliable than Collier, for example, as Collier forged data and Schoenbaum did not. Newer work also builds on older work, so that we expect a progression of accuracy as historical research on a subject continues across the centuries. Though later sources are generally more reliable then earlier sources, some considerations are involved. If an early source is already correct, for example, then no later source can improve on the veracity of the information. There may be improvements in the form of clarification, elucidation, and further commentary—these are valuable contributions too—but a fact such as the fable of the belly by Menenius in *Coriolanus* being based on a version by Camden rather than by Plutarch, which was correct when Malone stated it, is just as correct now. The emphasis in citations should be on allowing the reader to easily check that the information is correct. Another caveat is that earlier sources can bring information to light which then slips from scholarly attention. Such information then becomes "quasi-lost", available to anybody who consults the specific work but is not widely known. An example of this is the purchase of a book by either John or William Shakespeare from Joan Perrott on 25th August 1595. A valuable characteristic amongst secondary works, in other words, in addition to obvious characteristics such as being accurate, is that of being comprehensive. There is nothing to ensure that

more modern works are comprehensive, however, and comprehensiveness is difficult to test.

Sometimes secondary sources are required to give special expertise on a primary source. In these cases, secondary sources are actually preferable to primary sources for certain types of information. Examples include expert opinion on whether or not some evidence has been forged; palæographic analysis of the authorship of specific handwriting; and palæographic assistance in deciphering particularly bad handwriting. The latter is invaluable in reading the manuscript notes of Thomas Greene, who stayed at New Place and made several notes about Shakespeare; Schoenbaum says that even experienced palæographers have difficulty in understanding what Greene wrote.[16] Access to the physical copies of the primary sources can in these cases do nothing to assist the historian who does not have expertise in all of these highly specialist fields.

It is also important to use secondary sources in conjunction with primary sources. When studying the *Groatsworth of Wit*, it would be possible to read the primary source and come to certain conclusions about Greene. Looking at the wider context, however reveals intrigue concerning Chettle, Nashe, Munday, and others besides Greene and Shakespeare, leading to the conclusion that Chettle probably forged at least part of the *Groatsworth of Wit*. This in turn leads to new conclusions which can be drawn about Chettle's follow up, *The Kind-Heart's Dream*. At such a point the delineation into primary and secondary becomes a matter of style only, and redundant or naïve in any other usage. Interpretations reframe and recontextualise works so that their importance changes with new understanding.

3.3. Use of stylometric studies

Stylometric studies, including metrical tests, commentaries, and interpretations, are used only as a last resort. There are three points in the work where such a recourse has been made, to deduce: the author of *Edward III*; the author and date of the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, printed in 1602; and the date of *All's Well That Ends Well*.

In addition to these, acknowledgement of metrical tests have been made amongst other evidence in the commentaries on the dates of *King John* and *Timon of Athens*.

In the case of *Edward III*, a brief survey has been conducted of the range of speculations about *Edward III*. There is some consensus between these speculations, and this consensus has been noted. For the date of *All's Well That Ends Well*, a survey of speculative comparisons has already been conducted by Gary Taylor, but these comparisons are made relative to other plays—in other words, testing which plays most closely relate to *All's Well* in metrical tests—rather than to dates. The present work makes the contribution of mapping these comparisons to the dates argued elsewhere in this work for those plays. This allows those tests to be used to provide a tentative date for *All's Well*. The references to the tests for *King John* and *Timon of Athens* are made in the context of two plays which are amongst the most difficult of the Shakespearean canon to date, due to the paucity of both internal and external evidence concerning them.

The author and date of the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* are even more speculative than the *Edward III* and *All's Well* cases. This was included on the basis that the attribution of the additions to Shakespeare has only recently (2008) been suggested,[17] and that as yet there is no strong argument against this being the case. This compares to, for example, the *Funeral Elegy*: in 2002 the Oxford edition of Shakespeare's poems edited by Burrow found attribution to Shakespeare to be "improbable", and Donald Foster and Richard Abrams who had made the case for the attribution withdrew their claim.[18] In the present work, therefore, the *Funeral Elegy* is noted as at most being attributed to "W. S." in an attempt to capitalise on Shakespeare's name; "at most" meaning that this is only a possibility which must be noted.

Stylometric tests and opinion must be used and understood responsibly. They are valuable in inviting further attention to the possibilities involved, but dangerous in that unless their procedures and methods are published, and their methods verified and found to be repeatable, they can be at best arbitrary, and at worst entirely misleading. The evidence used in the present work only uses broad consensus between many different scholars (*Edward III*), a summary of many different tests by an

eminent Shakespearean scholar (Gary Taylor, *All's Well*), and a recent speculation that is included on the basis of disproof not yet coming to the attention of the author (additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*). These cases are all last resorts, and clearly indicated within the text as being speculative.

3.4. Leaving areas of research open

Shakespearean research contains many issues which it is not possible to resolve; some of these may yield to future investigation, and others will not. Good examples of open questions include where Shakespeare lived when he defaulted on tax in St. Helen's Bishopsgate, in October 1596, and what became of William Sadler (Shakespeare's possible godson) later in life after his baptism on 5th February 1598. These open research questions must be treated in the text, at least in the form of acknowledgement of their existence. Not only do they indicate areas where uncertainty exists, even in many cases after considerable attention has already been paid to them, but they also help to highlight those areas where other scholars' contributions would be helpful.

It can also help to characterise them in further ways. One alternative to leaving questions open is to advance a tentative interpretation. The way that much work on this subject progresses is that, to outline a scenario, a paper may be written advancing a theory about when a particular play was written, making a strong case for a speculative idea. This will be vigorously opposed in the next individual edition of the play. Somebody may later summarise the conflicting points of view, without getting involved in the debate. This debate can lead to reasonable results. An example of something like it can be seen in the arguments under c.1609, the writing of *Cymbeline*, where Andrew Gurr, Ros King, and Suzanne Gossett advance three different suggestions over the course of a several years. This example is one of the more successful outcomes of this style of research.

Unfortunately there are cases where the outcomes are not so successful. The model of what happens then may be roughly delineated as follows. A scholar will attach tentative or sometimes dubious interpretations to a point of research in order perhaps

to stimulate debate. Two consequences may result. One is that if the subject is obscure enough, nobody else will give the paper the criticism that it was intended to stimulate, and instead the paper is used as evidence uncritically. The responsibility here could be placed on the scholars who use the paper uncritically, but scholars do not always have expertise in neighbouring fields, and must use the most prominent recent findings that they have access to. The other consequence is that even if the paper does get the criticism that it deserves, the original arguments are deprecated neither quickly enough nor thoroughly enough. Their interpretations are inexorably attached to future work in more subtle ways, colouring future discourse on the subject. An example of this can be found under 31st January 1582, in the discussion of William Shakeshafte; this argument should receive much less attention than it does. In these cases, the treatment meted out to such arguments in the present work is usually to starve them of this unwarranted attention, and to attempt to obviate them from continuing to colour the debate. The William Shakeshafte section is a notable exception, serving at least the purpose of illustrating this point.

3.5. Integrating references

One drawback to using an extremely high density of references is that it can make a work appear to be a cento. A cento is a written work which has very little original content from the author, and is comprised mainly of quotes; a kind of commonplace book with additional comments. Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621) is a famous example of a work with an extremely high density of references which is sometimes characterised, including by Burton himself, as a cento. In Burton's case, his exceptional erudition has been recognised, and his density of references is taken as a reflection of his wide reading. Burton provides a defence of his case, written in his usual florid but widely admired style, with Dr. Johnson and John Keats amongst those who praised him, a style usable in modern academic publications only in quotation:

> I haue laboriously collected this *Cento* out of many Authors, the method onely is mine owne, and I must vsurpe that of *Wecker è Terentio, nihil dictum quod non dictum prius, methodus sola artificem ostendit*, we can say nothing but what hath beene said, the composition and method is ours onely, and shewes a

> scholler. *Oribasius*, *Aesius*, *Auicenna*, haue all out of Galen, but to their owne method, our Poets steale from *Homer*, Diuines vse *Austins* words *verbatim* still, and our story-dressers doe no other[19]

Despite the admiration drawn by Burton, the present chronology does not adhere to this design and does not constitute a cento. It is instead designed along three models of writing, in descending order of priority. The first model is to discover new evidence and devise new interpretations for evidence where possible. The second is to summarise existing research as widely as possible where new evidence and interpretations are not forthcoming. The third is to comprehensively mention the points in question. The work is balanced between these three models of writing. A resemblance to centoism could apply only to certain passages using the second model. It has been difficult to find even an example of this in the present work, so such resemblances may not appear especially pervasive to the reader. A strong argument against anti-centoism may still, however, be influential in convincing others to use a high density of references in their own work.

Under the entry for the revisions to *Troilus and Cressida* in 1601, there is the following comment about the War of the Theatres, with italicised footnote references representing those given in the main text:

> In June 1601, the War of the Theatres started, with Jonson pitting his wits against Marston and Dekker.[1] In the same year, Jonson and Marston collaborated on the *Poetical Essays*, so if the quarrel was real then perhaps those essays came earlier in the year, and the war afterwards. Jonson is recorded as having said that he once beat Marston and stole his pistol,[2] though whether that was in this year or not is unknown.

The first reference is ostensibly to confirm that there was a War of the Theatres, and to show the date on which it started. But it also serves the purpose of referring to a work which treats the subject more widely, and does so in the context of *Troilus and Cressida*. This is followed by an observation using the first model, discussing the social connection between Jonson and Marston, poets involved in the War of the Theatres.

This refers to earlier work in the chronology, immediately reshaping the discourse. The second footnote comes half way through a sentence, indicating that the first half is a fact taken from a source, and that the second half is a comment on that fact. This fact was chosen to complement the work on the social connection between Jonson and Marston.

So already, though the first three sentences have two footnotes, it is not the case that these sentences are atomic facts uncritically and isomorphically reflecting single sources. The selection of which facts to use is important, and the reader cannot know of the number of references *left out* of a section which will still have shaped and informed its discourse. The summary of c.1599, the writing of *As You Like It*, is a particularly good example in this regard, with one short section of text having many thousands of words of rough notes behind it, distilled into an essence. The *Troilus and Cressida* passage continues (not quoted above) by quoting Jonson and Shakespeare, showing them to be in dialogue. This dialogue has been noted before, and footnotes are given to two sources who agree on the characterisation. Neither of these scholars, however, situate the discussion of the characterisation in the context of a discussion about Jonson and Marston, relative to their work conducted in 1601 on the *Poetical Essays*, which they wrote with Shakespeare. I have made an argument that Marston was the progenitor of that project, and argued also for the general social dynamics underpinning that work. The section concludes with another fact cited from a paper about the origins of *Troilus and Cressida* by Kimbrough (1962). This indicates how out of the societal discussion comes the dating evidence for the play. In other words, the whole section is shown to have been a multiparadigmatic ruse: not only is it a good excuse to talk about the wider context of the play, and the societal implications, but it also allows links to be made with existing discussions, and all for the purpose of dating the play.

What may appear at first as a cento will usually turn out to be far more complex. And even in the cases where a work adheres very strongly to being an apparently uncritical cento, incorporating the work of many authors with little comment, it is possible for it to give an entirely novel argument or display considerable erudition. Quoting two authors who contradict one another, for example, without anyone else having given

attention to the contradiction, is a novel kind of work without the author having to write any of their own words. Irenæus creates a new story in his *Adversum Haereses* using his own selection—of lines Od. 10.76, 21.26, Il. 19.123, 8.368, Od. 6.130, Il. 24.327, Od. 11.38, Il. 24.328, Od. 11.626, and Il. 2.409—from the works of Homer. The selection, distillation, and presentation of quotes are important components of the process of research.

3.6. Computer science and humanities problems

Since my background is in computer science, people have often suggested that I write computer programs to aid me in my work on Shakespeare. One of the most common suggestions is using genealogy software to note the connections between people. It is difficult to explain just how complex the process of early modern genealogy is. Genealogical data is very often not clear, but works along the lines of indications. Two people with the same quite rare surname live in the same small town for a while, say, so that they are probably related. But how might they be related? There may be a diary reference to one of them, and the connotations of the words used may indicate that the person is old, whereas the other person is known from baptismal records to be younger. From this one might guess at a relationship across generations, perhaps father son, or uncle and nephew. The more that such data accumulates, the more challenging and often the more exciting the act of genealogy becomes.

Studying Shakespeare can throw up all manner of surprising details. In the entry for 1584 which discusses John Shakespeare's spiritual will, I note that Malone gives a palaeographic analysis of a text which was later lost. To provide a modern analysis of the missing text, which may perhaps still be considered a branch of palæography, we need to know what the state of palæography was at the time when Malone was making his evaluation. In fact Malone even gives specific examples of manuscripts to which he was comparing the text, but he does not note which characteristics he compares. He does not even note what we would now consider basic characteristics, such as whether the hands are secretary or italian.

This level of complexity amongst the situations and data is normal, not exceptional. I have tried to develop my own expertise and facility for dealing with such complexity during the course of working on this study. Because of the complexity, however, it is difficult to abstract or extrapolate any general findings from these developments. The results can at least be seen in the study itself. An introduction in such case can be no substitute for the main content of a study.

4. Conventions and style

4.1. Style of quoted references

I generally only give the author, year, title, and page number of references, except in the case of primary sources and journal entries, where I give more information. I keep footnotes along with the text to give them co-prominence. I avoid latin citation abbreviations, in order to minimise confusion. This makes terse reference necessary, and in the digital age it is far less useful to give an overabundance of reference data. The most commonly used texts are abbreviated down to just an author and initials of the work, such as "EKC F&P2" for what would otherwise be known across many pages as "Chambers, E. K. (1930). William Shakespeare: Facts and Problems. Vol. 2." Modern editions of Shakespeare are attributed to Shakespeare, with their editors and the series (but not the publisher) noted as a convenience. When an author is given in interpolation brackets, the orignal attribution is considered suspect and the bracketed attribution reflects the modern consensus. The reference to "Shakespeare, William and Fletcher, John [Middleton, Thomas?] (1994). Cardenio, or, the Second Maiden's Tragedy. Hamilton, Charles (ed.)", for example, means that the editor Charles Hamilton attributed this work to Shakespeare and Fletcher, but that modern consensus suggests authorship by Middleton more likely.

References are underlined. A very small number of unchecked references, usually those which are cited in other works as their source, are included for convenience and are not given an underline. Some bibliographical abbreviations are used, with all but EEBO, which refers to the Early English Books Online website, defined in a table preceding the main text. Volumes are introduced with a "Vol." marker except when an issue within a volume is referred to, where then a compound number representing the volume and issue is used, e.g. "5.20". All volume, and volume and issue, numbers are normalised to arabic numerals.

4.2. Style of play quotations

Quotations from the plays are usually given from the First Folio or from an early quarto, to reflect the primary sources. Titles of plays are usually given in long form, with short titles including the determiner, such as *The Tempest*, but long titles omitting them, such as the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, though sometimes an exception will be made to this at the beginning of sentences. References to specific scenes in a play are given using arabic numerals due to their superior readability over roman numerals. These are usually introduced with the word "Act", so that for example "Act 3.2" refers to Act 3, Scene 2; the grouping here can be seen as Act 3 being the core, and .2 giving a refinement thereof. Sometimes an act and scene number may be given without the introducing "Act", and in such cases it ought to be obvious from context that the number refers to a scene and that no further apparatus is necessary to explain the reference. Sometimes I use short versions of the play names, especially when discussing many plays in a short section.

Sometimes these conventions, and other wider conventions, may be broken. One example of a wider convention occasionally broken is the avoidance of the first person pronoun. I have used it where I have found it necessary for the purpose of clear exposition, at the expense of consistent style. Clear exposition assists people in their research, whereas consistent style is more of an æsthetic convenience. The guiding principle has always been to make things as easy as possible for the reader.

4.3. Style of play precision

One of the stylistic choices in making a chronology is what sort of dates should be allowed. Should approximate dates be allowed, for example? What about dates with different degrees of precision, or even date ranges? In this work, approximate dates are indicated in entries with a "c." prefix, for Latin *circa* (about), and sometimes in text with English "about" or "around". Precisions allowed are: a specific day, a specific month, or a specific year. Seasons or other similar divisions of the year are not, for example, allowed, and nor are decades. Date ranges are disallowed entirely. They may be indicated with their opening and closing dates, as for example with

periods of theatre closures. The lack of date ranges has important ramifications for the representation of plays in the chronology.

Due to the lack of ranges, the estimated creation date of each Shakespearean play is entered under a single year, with a relevant degree of approximation. The year under which a play is entered if this year is an approximation represents the year when the play was most likely primarily written. In certain circumstances, it may appear quite undesirable to represent the plays in this way. Is it wise, for example, to enter the writing of *All's Well That Ends Well* under 1604, when in fact the complexity of the evidence allows a margin of error of several years to either side?

In fact, the opposite can be argued. Not only is it desirable, but it would be desirable in many instances to place the plays with more specificity. The argument is that even with a date range, that range must be placed in the work at some point. Say for example that *All's Well That Ends Well* had the range 1601–1608, and was to be entered in the work somewhere. Naturally, all ranges in the work would have to have a consistent plan of entry, and the most logical point of insertion for a range is under the date associated with the start of the range. This would mean that *All's Well That Ends Well* would appear in the work associated with the entries for the year 1601.

The nature of a date range is such that usually the probability curve has a peak towards the middle of the range for the associated event. In other words, with some exceptions such as with Mary Arden's date of birth, and indeed to a lesser extent in the case of the writing of *All's Well That Ends Well*, not only are the years within a range of generally pairwise dissimilar probabilities, but the most natural insertion point for the range, the beginning, is often one of the least probable amongst all the alternative years. In the case of *All's Well That Ends Well*, though the years 1601–1608 all have a level of plausibility, 1604 is actually the most highly probable (which is not necessarily to say that it is of high probability) amongst these alternatives. This means that it is more natural to insert it in the chronology at the year 1604.

Since it is more natural to enter a play where it is most likely to have been written, even if it is one from a range of possibilities, the lack of ranges in this case is not as

much of a drawback as it would appear. The only problem is that one must refer to the detailed entry to see the full arguments about the range. Even this might be considered an advantage, since "c.1604" may be seen as an obvious simplification of the date of the play, whereas "1601–1608" is also a simplification, because it does not show the probability profile of the range, and yet since it is a more subtle simplification it may also be seen as more insidious. In many cases it would have been desirable to have gone further, and used divisions of years to place the plays. In other words, for example it would have been preferable to date the writing of *Henry V* to Late Spring 1599 instead of just 1599, as this would place it below events such as the formation of the Globe syndicate on 21st February 1599, which would be more accurate in terms of known evidence. But divisons such as Late Spring are not so easily amenable to standardisation as the levels of precision ultimately chosen for this work.

4.4. Use of the Julian calendar

Dated events in this work all use the Julian calendar which was in use in England before 1752, and not the proleptic Gregorian calendar. The Gregorian calendar was already in use on the continent in the Eliza-Jacobean period, but not in England. Works about the Eliza-Jacobean period in England conventionally use the Julian calendar, and in this regard the dates will not unduly perturb experienced readers.

4.5. Use of New Style dates

Though the Julian calendar is used herein, the Old Style new year is not. Instead, with one class of exception, the proleptic New Style is used throughout. The new year in the Eliza-Jacobean period, referred to as the Old Style new year, started on Lady Day, the 25th March.[20] The modern new year, starting on the New Style date of 1st January, was not adopted until later. When a date is given between 1st January and 24th March inclusive, scholars often use a technique called a split date, which gives the year in both Old Style and New Style. This technique is, unfortunately, the source of much confusion, and has therefore been eschewed entirely. All dates are instead normalised to the proleptic New Style, with one class of exception, unless stated otherwise. When stated, for example, that an event occurred on 1st February 1595,

this means that it occurred on 1st February 1594 in the Old Style, and that three months later it would be 1st May 1595 in both Old and New Styles. The reasons behind the use of proleptic New Style are given below in the consideration of split dates.

The one class of exception to the use of proleptic New Style is in the title pages of printed works from the Old Style period. The year given for any individual work will be what is given on the title page, and what was used on the title page is supposed to reflect the Old Style date that was in use at the time. In practice, however, this was not always the case. Publishers liked to date their books early, using a new year on the title page when it was not yet Lady Day. This means that in practice the publishing industry used a system perhaps more akin to the New Style, though it is unclear how widespread and consistent this practice was. Therefore, it should be noted that when a date is used in connection with a printed work, that date refers to the date on the title page; and that any further interpretation of the title page date is separate to the mention of the title page date in this work. Often that interpretation will be given too if necessary; otherwise, standard considerations for title page dates apply, such as the tendency to use something more akin to the New Style as outlined above.

4.6. Avoidance of split dates

Split dates are avoided due to their ambiguity. The split date format reflects the fact that the Elizabethan new year could be reckoned as starting on either the 1st January in the civil calendar, or the 25th March in the ecclesiastical calendar. According to Carol Chillington Rutter, split dates are meant to be read as ecclesiastical first followed by civil.[21] Though split dates are meant to avoid confusion, the system has a crucial flaw: without being sure of the convention one can interpret split dates quite differently, and in a way which is still consistent with good historical practice.

The alternative interpretation is as follows. Say that you have a document which bears the date "5th February 1597"[22] If it uses the civil reckoning, then the modernisation is 1597. If it uses the ecclesiastical reckoning, the modernisation is 1598. If you do not know which reckoning is used, then it is logical to transcribe "1597–8" as the

range of modernisations which are possible. This is a quite reasonable thing to expect a scholar to have done. The ecclesiastical-first system depends on one knowing, from context or other means, which reckoning is used. The interpretation where the reckoning is not known is, on the other hand, perfectly coherent. It may be what misled Nicholas Fogg to interpret this date, which is a real textual problem, as 1597.

The ecclesiastical-first system is, moreover, more difficult to demonstrate as being a reasonable system where the reckoning is known. One may think of it in the following way. When Malone says that the baptism took place in "1597–8" then there are four possibilities for what Malone read in the original document. Let C stand for Civil, E for Ecclesiastical, and M for Modernised. 5th Feb 1597 C in the original maps to 1596 E, 1597 M. In this case, one would not put 1597–8, but 1596–7. 5th Feb 1597 E maps to 1598 C, 1598 M. This is consistent with the split date 1597–8. 5th Feb 1598 C maps to 1597 E, 1598 M. This is also consistent with the split date. 5th Feb 1598 E maps to 1599 C, 1599 M. This is inconsistent. So using the ecclesiastical-first system, where the reckoning is known, the only possible dates that Malone could have read in the original are 5th Feb 1597 E (1598 M), or 5th Feb 1598 C (1598 M).

To avoid the confusion here, the practice of split dates perhaps ought to be abandoned, and modernisation used where possible. Unfortunately we still have the problem of legacy split dates to deal with: who is to say that Fogg's modernisation of Malone, perhaps using the logic stated above, is not accurate—that Malone has not used the same logic? After all, the ecclesiastical-first split date system depends entirely on the historian being able to derive by context whether the civil or the ecclesiastical reckoning has been used. This is not always possible, and so what format should one use in such a case? Peter Beal in his *Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology* (2008) says that in such cases some modern historians use single quotes for the year,[23] but this practice does not seem common, and only increases the confusion and possibility for error to creep in.

4.7. Use of ordinal indicators

Another common convention for representing dates is to use a form such as 1 January 1600, with a bare ordinal indicating the day. Instead, I use the form 1st January 1600, with ordinal indicators. The motivation is that dates with ordinal indicators are more easily distinguished by eye than ones without. Perhaps there is some comparison to be made here with why many languages have gender and cases for nouns, why grammatical agreement is reflected in morphological characteristics, and even why the serifs on printed glyphs can enhance reading speed. The forms of dates are left unaltered in quoted works. Alterations are not made in quoted works except when using interpolation brackets to indicate the change, or when the change is noted in the accompanying text. One can of course become too obsessed with style and revision. In the process of editing this work I annotated some changes in ink on a printed copy, and made a particularly high number of corrections to just a small passage of text. When I got to the end of a sentence, I noticed a closing quotation mark; I had missed the opening quotation mark. I had been making heavy editorial corrections to the marvellous prose of that celebrated early 20th century Shakespeare scholar, Edgar Innes Fripp!

Introduction notes

A list of bibliographical abbreviations follows these notes.

[1] EKC F&P2, p.329
[2] Taylor, Rupert (1945). Shakespeare's Cousin, Thomas Greene, and His Kin. Publications of the Modern Language Association, 60.1. pp.87–93 of pp.81–94
[3] See text for details, and for 1 and 2 Contention naming convention
[4] Shakespeare, William (2008n). The History of King Lear: The 1608 Quarto. Wells, Stanley (ed.). Oxford. p.5
[5] EKC F&P2, p.398
[6] Shakespeare, William (1998c). The First Quarto of Hamlet. Irace, Kathleen O. (ed.). Cambridge. p.4
[7] Shakespeare, William (2005e). King Lear. Halio, Jay L. (ed.). Cambridge. p.75
[8] Hornback, Robert B. (2004). The Fool in Quarto and Folio King Lear. In English Literary Renaissance, 34.3. p.337
[9] Ioppolo, Grace (1991). Revising Shakespeare. p.93
[10] Jones, John (1995). Shakespeare at Work. pp.247–8
[11] Marwick, Arthur (1970). The Nature of History. p.132
[12] McCulloch, Gary (2004). Documentary Research: In Education, History and the Social Sciences. p.30. McCulloch's work is about the social sciences, but his review of primary and secondary sources is generic and applicable to all fields of historical research.
[13] White, Hayden (1995). Response to Arthur Marwick. In the Journal of Contemporary History. Vol. 30, No. 2. pp.233–246
[14] Jenkins, Keith and Munslow, Alun (2003). Re-Thinking History. p.18
[15] "Chronographical" is a blend or portmanteau of chronological and bibliographical, extended from the existing term homonymically.
[16] SS R&I, p.75
[17] Stevenson, Warren (2008). Shakespeare's Additions to Thomas Kyd's "The Spanish Tragedy": A Fresh Look at the Evidence Regarding the 1602 Additions
[18] Burrow, Colin (ed.) (2002). The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Sonnets and Poems. p.152, and Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems. p.468
[19] Burton, Robert (1621). The Anatomy of Melancholy. EEBO, STC 4159
[20] Dobranski, Stephen B. (2005). Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England. p.158
[21] Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.30, Beal, Peter (2008). A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology. p.107
[22] Q.v. 5th February 1598 in the text for the specific case.
[23] Beal, Peter (2008). A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology. p.107

Bibliographical abbreviations

Arber = Arber, Edward (ed.) (1875). A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640.

DLB 263 = Loomis, Catherine (ed.) (2002). William Shakespeare: a Documentary Volume. Dictionary of Literary Biography, Vol.263.

EKC Allusions = Chambers, E. K.; Ingleby, Clement Mansfield; Furnivall, Frederick James; Munro, John; and Smith, L. Toulmin (1932). The Shakespere Allusion-Book.

EKC ES 1 = Chambers, E. K. (1923). Elizabethan Stage. Vol.1.

EKC ES 2 = Chambers, E. K. (1923). Elizabethan Stage. Vol.2.

EKC ES 3 = Chambers, E. K. (1923). Elizabethan Stage. Vol.3.

EKC ES 4 = Chambers, E. K. (1923). Elizabethan Stage. Vol.4.

EKC F&P1 = Chambers, E. K. (1930). William Shakespeare: Facts and Problems. Vol.1.

EKC F&P2 = Chambers, E. K. (1930). William Shakespeare: Facts and Problems. Vol.2.

Eccles = Eccles, Mark (1961). Shakespeare in Warwickshire.

Fripp M&A1 = Fripp, Edgar Innes (1938). Shakespeare: Man and Artist. Vol.1.

Fripp M&A2 = Fripp, Edgar Innes (1938). Shakespeare: Man and Artist. Vol.2.

HP O1 = Halliwell-Phillipps, James Orchard (1889). Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. 8th Edition. Vol.1.

HP O2 = Halliwell-Phillipps, James Orchard (1889). Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. 8th Edition. Vol.2.

Honan = Honan, Park (1999). Shakespeare: A Life.

Lee = Lee, Sidney (1902). Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies: A Census of Extant Copies.

SS CDL = Schoenbaum, S. (1987). Shakespeare: A Compact Documentary Life.

SS DL = Schoenbaum, S. (1975). William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life.

SS R&I = Schoenbaum, S. (1981). William Shakespeare: Records and Images.

STC = Pollard, A. W. and Redgrave, G. R. (1926). A short-title catalogue of books.

West = West, Anthony James (2003). The Shakespeare First Folio.

Wing = Wing, Donald (1951). Short-title catalogue of books.

Shakespearean Chronology
1530 to 1623

1530

c.1530 — John Shakespeare is born.

§ The earliest known documentary record regarding John is a fine in April 1552 for the possession of a sterquinarium, a dung heap, outside his Henley Street residence in Stratford.[1] As he was responsible for the residence connected with this fine, he must have been an adult in 1552.[2] Taking 1530 as a base guess for the year of John's birth, this fine would have been levied at age 22, his marriage would have been age 26 or so, first child at 28, last child at 50, and death at 71.[3] Fripp guesses "1529 or earlier" as the year of John's birth,[4] with which Eccles agrees.[5] This date has become a suspicious certainty in one modern biography,[6] which may serve as an example of a process whereby guesses are repeated with ever more certainty until they become purported facts.

Fripp perhaps guessed 1529 instead of 1530 because he linked the event of John's birth with the first known appearance in Snitterfield of Richard Shakespeare,[7] the most likely candidate for John's father. The rationale may have been that the family moved to a new home that had better amenities for caring for a newborn baby. But they may also have moved upon finding that the mother was pregnant, or had moved for other reasons before or shortly after the start of the pregnancy. Because moving and also caring for a newborn seems the less reasonable case, an estimate of 1530 is the most reasonable for the year of John's birth. The choice of 1530 as an estimate also has the benefit of avoiding the unwarranted connotation of precision associated with 1529.

[1] SS CDL, p.17. [2] Eccles, p.24. [3] Q.v. c.May 1557, 15th September 1558, 3rd May 1580, and 8th September 1601. [4] Fripp, Edgar Innes (1929). Shakespeare's Haunts near Stratford. p.91. [5] Eccles, p.24. [6] Ackroyd, Peter (2005). Shakespeare: The Biography. p.21. [7] Savage, Richard (1910). Shakespearean Extracts from Edward Pudsey's Booke. p.81, full title "Shakespearean Extracts from 'Edward Pudsey's Booke' Temp. Q. Elizabeth & K. James I."

§ John's father was probably the Richard Shakespeare who was a farmer in Snitterfield, three miles north-east of Stratford. This is indicated only by circumstantial evidence,

some aspects of which are problematic. The most indicative record is that on 10th February 1561, after Richard died, a "Johannem Shakespere de Snytterfyld in comitatu Warwici agricolam"—i.e. John Shakespeare of Snitterfield in Warwick county, farmer—applied for administration of Richard's estate,[1] a task usually carried out by the eldest son. But there are difficulties even here: John was living in Stratford, not Snitterfield in 1561,[2] and he was a glover, not a farmer.[3] Although he may have owned unrecorded farm holdings, he isn't referred to as a farmer in any other document of this period.

Eccles explains these problems away by noting that the Worcester records in which the statement appears make many errors.[4] Chambers says of this record only that it would be "unreasonable" not to accept the Snitterfield farmer as John Shakespeare of Stratford, but does not explain why.[5] The John who took over Richard's estate was at any rate fined twelvepence on 1st October 1561 for not keeping the hedges in proper order,[6] so if it were John of Stratford, glover, making an application for administration of his father's estate, perhaps he was referred to as John of Snitterfield, farmer, with this upcoming inheritance in mind.

[1] EKC F&P2, p.26. [2] HP O2, p.219 shows John to have been elected one of the Stratford corporation chamberlains in 1561, for example. Compare also the surrounding context. [3] Eccles, p.25 shows that a John Shakespeare, glover, was involved in a lawsuit. HP O2, p.219 gives John signing a mark in 1556 as a "pair of compasses", which also indicates that John was a glover in the period around 1561, compasses being one of the tools used to mark out the leather. [4] Eccles, p.9. [5] EKC F&P2, p.26. [6] EKC F&P2, p.27.

§ Apart from the application to administrate Richard's estate, there are only two other indications connecting John and Richard Shakespeare. First, Richard held freehold on a house belonging to Robert Arden, the father of John's future wife.[1] Second, a Henry Shakespeare is said to be the brother of a John Shakespeare in a lawsuit stretching through 1587.[2] This Henry lived in Snitterfield,[3] and possibly nearby Ingon, which is less than an hour's walk from Stratford. This gives John a weak family connection to Richard through Robert Arden, and maybe to Snitterfield through Henry Shakespeare.

Chambers says that the various data regarding Henry Shakespeare enable us to reasonably infer that "Henry, like John Shakespeare, was a son of Richard Shakespeare

of Snitterfield",[4] and Eccles makes the same assessment.[5] Neither of them explicitly say why they believe that Henry was the son of Richard Shakespeare. The only two points which may suggest this are (a) that Henry was called as a witness with John in a 1582 suit about a farm once occupied by Richard, and (b) that Henry is a Shakespeare who lived in the same small village as Richard. But the 1582 suit was against Edward Cornwell, Agnes Arden, and Robert Webbe. Agnes was John's mother-in-law, Edward was her son-in-law, and Robert Webbe was Agnes's grandson through Edward.[6] Also the nature of John's evidence in the suit is not known.[7] John and Henry Shakespeare were not most obviously involved because they were potential sons of Richard Shakespeare who had owned the farm, therefore, but because they were closely related to the defendants. These readings of the records show it to be more likely that Henry and John Shakespeare the poet's father were brothers—the John said to be Henry's brother received his bail from a Stratford alderman, for example—than that Richard Shakespeare was the father of both.

Richard is first recorded as living in Snitterfield when he receives a fine on "Thursday after Hokeday, 20 hen. VIII",[8] i.e. 15th April 1529, Hokeday being the Tuesday after Easter. The lawsuit does not identify whether Henry is an elder or younger brother of John, but if Richard is their father then the fact that John obtained administration of his land on 10th February 1561 despite the fact that Henry was living closer would indicate that he is the elder brother. This in turn may bear on Richard moving to Snitterfield, if a family is less likely to move once it starts becoming established than before the couple have had children.

[1] Eccles, pp.8–9. [2] HP O2, p.241. [3] EKC F&P2, p.14. [4] EKC F&P2, p.15. In further connection with this, EKC F&P2, p.27 says "a Stratford suit showing a John and a Henry Shakespeare as brothers (cf. no. i) helps to identify John of Stratford with John of Snitterfield", perhaps because the suit was filed in Stratford. [5] Eccles, p.12. [6] French, George Russell (1869). Shakspeareana Genealogica: Part I. pp.479–80. [7] HP O2, pp.236–8. [8] Savage, Richard (1910). Shakespearean Extracts from Edward Pudsey's Booke. p.81, full title "Shakespearean Extracts from 'Edward Pudsey's Booke' Temp. Q. Elizabeth & K. James I."

§ Richard and Henry were not the only two 16th century Shakespeares in or around Snitterfield. An Anthony Shakespeare is recorded there in 1569, though he later seems to have moved, and a Thomas Shakespeare is recorded there from the 1560s to the at

least the 1580s.[1] A Johanna Shakespeare was buried there in 1596.[2] The relations between these people, and their relations if any to John, Henry, and Richard, are uncertain. There was also a John Shakespeare in Clifford Chambers, just over a mile south-west of Stratford, who died in 1610.[3] He's sometimes confused, not surprisingly, with John of Stratford the glover. It may be that some references to John Shakespeare in local records actually pertain to the Clifford Chambers John. Clifford Chambers is in Gloucestershire, and because of this there may be an administrative bias against the Clifford Chambers John Shakespeare when considering his records. Though he lived in a different county, it should be emphasised that Clifford Chambers is closer to Stratford than Snitterfield. Clifford Chambers and Snitterfield are, moreover, only five miles apart with Stratford between them.

[1] Eccles, p.11. [2] EKC F&P2, p.14. [3] EKC F&P2, p.16.

§ Leslie Hotson made, in 1935, two intriguing finds regarding people bearing the surname Shakespeare in Stratford. The first was the record of a John Shakespeare, yeoman, present in Stratford in 1533.[1] This was the first time a Shakespeare had been found living in Stratford immediately prior to the poet's father. This John can't be the same as the poet's father as "yeoman" indicates an adult status, and the poet's father was an infant in 1533. Without further information, it is impossible to rule this elder John out as a candidate for some close relation to the poet through his father.

Hotson's second discovery provides yet another candidate for a close relation to the poet through his father. It had been known that a Christopher Shakespeare of Packwood, over ten miles north of Stratford, mentions his children Alice, William, Roger, Richard, John, and Christopher Jr. in his 1557 will.[2] Hotson's discovery was a lawsuit of 1561, which mentions a "Richard Shackspere of Packwood", a "John Shackspere of Stretford Apon Aven", and a "Roger Shackspere of Pacwood" in conjunction.[3] There is nothing that describes all three of them collectively as the children of Christopher and Isabella Shakespeare of Packwood, or even as siblings, but it is a possibility. There is also no evidence for or against the possibility that this "John Shackspere of Stretford" was the poet's father. The main evidence against a direct paternal connection between John, the poet's father, and Christopher Shakespeare is

that Christopher does not mention a Henry in his will, and yet it is certain that the Henry Shakespeare mentioned in the 1587 lawsuit is John's brother, and reasonably certain that this lawsuit John was the poet's father. Yet the evidence from the lawsuit and Christopher's will is strange, because there is no other John Shakespeare known to be living in Stratford in 1561.[4] John Shakespeare the poet's father may, therefore, have been related to Christopher Shakespeare of Packwood.

[1] Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.582. [2] Taylor, Rupert (1945). Shakespeare's Cousin, Thomas Greene, and His Kin. Publications of the Modern Language Association, 60.1. pp.90–2. [3] Hotson, Leslie (1949). Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated. p.223. [4] According to Eccles, p.11, John of Clifford Chambers had a brother called Thomas so the John of Stratford in the lawsuit is unlikely to refer to him.

§ One small piece of circumstantial evidence supports a Packwood connection of some kind of to the poet's family. The chronicler Raphael Holinshed, whose work Shakespeare made much use of as a source for his plays,[1] was according to his will the steward of Thomas Burdett, lord of the manor of Packwood.[2] Holinshed may have known the Shakespeare family in Packwood as part of his duties. Rupert Taylor has also discovered a tentative connection between Thomas Greene and the Packwood Shakespeares, which would satisfy a familial link documented later but contemporaneously between William and Thomas.[3]

[1] Gillespie, Stuart (2004). Shakespeare's Books: a Dictionary of Shakespeare Sources. p.240 is a good starting point, but there are several extended treatments of Shakespeare's use of Holinshed. See, for example, Goy-Blanquet, Dominique (2003). Shakespeare's Early History Plays: From Chronicle to Stage. [2] Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.295. [3] Taylor, Rupert (1945). Shakespeare's Cousin, Thomas Greene, and His Kin. Publications of the Modern Language Association, 60.1. pp.87–93.

§ The paternal genealogy of John Shakespeare is more often discussed than his maternal genealogy, but some notes have been made regarding his mother. R.B. Wheler wrote in 1816 that John's mother was the sister of Agnes Arden, born Agnes Webbe, who was the stepmother of John's future wife,[1] and one later source gives her name as Abigail Webb.[2] In this kind of connection, Richard Shakespeare of Snitterfield held freehold on a manor of Agnes's husband Robert. But though this information sounds plausible, and though Henry Ward calls R.B. Wheler a "very careful local

historian",[3] it is strange that Agnes thought to bequeath money and sheep to the children of both her first husband and her brother, and yet not mention a sister or any of her sister's children (such as Henry Shakespeare), one of whom had supposedly married her step-daughter Mary.[4] Wheler is, therefore, unlikely to have been correct. When such reports are made without any provenance, they are difficult to assess. John Payne Collier guessed at "Joan" as the name of John Shakespeare's mother,[5] on the basis of two of John's daughters being named Joan, the first having died in infancy. Fripp says, without giving explanation or evidence, that John's mother was probably "a Greene of Warwick".[6]

[1] From French, George Russell (1869). Shakspeareana Genealogica: Part I. p.360 and Ward, Henry Snowden (1896). Shakespeare's Town and Times. p.51. [2] Webb Wilcox, Reynold, et al. (1938). Wilcoxson-Wilcox, Webb and Meigs families. National Historical Society. p.135. [3] Snowden Ward, Henry (1896). Shakespeare's Town and Times. p.51. [4] HP O2, pp.54–5. [5] Collier, John Payne (1858). Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, Tragedies, and Poems. p.50. [6] Fripp M&A1, p.33.

1538

c.1538 — Mary Arden is born.

§ When Mary's father Robert Arden made his will on 24th November 1556, Mary was appointed an executrix along with her elder sister Alice.[1] According to Eccles, Mary and Alice proved the will in December 1556.[2] In 1668, Thomas Wentworth, citing a casebook of Sir Edward Coke first published in 1605, discusses the matter of the minimum age for an executor of a will:

"Now touching an Infant made Executor, how young soever he be, the making of him so is not void; but yet the Execution of the Will, which is the performance of the office of Executor, shall not be committed to him till he come to the age of seventeen Years, by the Law Spiritual, and till then (for that he is not able to doe the part of an Executor,) Administration is to be committed to some other: yet if it be a Woman Infant who is so made Executrix, in case she be married to a man of seventeen years old or more, now is it as if she were of that age, and her Husband shall have the Execution of the Will"[3]

This means that Mary would have to have been seventeen years old in December 1556, giving us the latest possible bound for her birth as December 1539. For the earliest bound, it is necessary to use the birth of her last child as an indicator of the oldest she could have been on that occasion.

In 1986, Menken et al. published an article which includes a chart of fertility rate by age for 1000 wives taken from ten population samples spanning several centuries, including one from Geneva bourgeoisie where the husbands were born from 1600–49.[4] This chart shows fertility plummeting to less than 50 per mille in all population samples by about age 47; the populations from older centuries also have lower rates than from more recent centuries. The rate of one in ten is reached in the Geneva population at about age 44. Taking 46 years of age as the maximum reasonable maternal age for an Elizabethan female, we arrive at an earliest possible age 46 years before the age of Mary's last child, Edmund Shakespeare, who was baptised

on 3rd May 1580. Mary is very unlikely to have been born before May 1534; she would have been at the one-in-ten Geneva fertility rate with Edmund if she were born in May 1536.

The evidence therefore confines the possible birth year of Mary Arden to a relatively small range. Furthermore, though Mary was probably born between May 1536 and December 1539, dates towards the end of that period are to be favoured over dates towards the beginning, due to the rate of fertility decreasing sharply towards the mid 40s. A probability apex at around 1538 seems most reasonable, as avoiding both extremes but recognising the precedence of the fertility argument. This still makes it interesting that Robert's youngest daughter, who was at most in her very early 20s when the will was signed, was appointed as one of her father's two executrices.

Scholars have made various comments on the point of Mary's distinction as executrix. Collier thought that this made it very unlikely that Mary could have been as young as eighteen when she was married.[5] Schoenbaum says that Mary "inspired fonder thoughts" in Robert than did Robert's wife Agnes.[6] Park Honan says that the appointment is a sign that Robert "found some merits" in Mary, which he supports by mentioning the fact that Robert also bequeathed to Mary his "most valuable property, Asbyes, at Wilmcote."[7]

[1] HP O2, p.53, "Allso I ordene and constytute and make my full exceqtores Ales and Marye, my dowghteres, of this my last will and testament, and they to have no more for ther peynes-takyng now as afore geven them." Also mentioned in Eccles, p.17. [2] Eccles, p.22. [3] Wentworth, Thomas (1668). The Office and Duty of Executors. EEBO, Wing W1361A. p.308, with a sidenote to "Co. lib. 5. fol. 29. p." This refers to the fifth book, "liber", of the Reports of Sir Edward Coke. According to Baker, John (1972). Coke's Note-Books and the Sources of His Reports. Cambridge Law Journal, 30.1. p.73 the fifth book, or part, was published in 1605. Baker gives notices about Coke's sources for this fifth part. [4] Menken, Jane, et al. (1986). Age and Infertility. Science, 233.4771. September 1986. p.1390. Via Heffner, Linda J. (2004). Advanced Maternal Age — How Old Is Too Old? The New England Journal of Medicine, Vol. 351. pp.1927–29, who incorrectly references the Menken et al. article as "Age and fertility". [5] Collier, John Payne (1853b). The Works of Shakespeare. Vol. 1. pp.lxv–lxvi. [6] SS CDL, p.21. [7] Honan, p.14.

1552

29th April 1552 — John Shakespeare is fined for building a dungheap on Henley Street.

* Facsimile in SS DL, p.15. Cf. HP O2, p.215, Eccles, p.24.

1556

c.1556 — Anne Hathaway is born.

§ Shakespeare's wife is famously said to be "Annam Whateley" of Temple Grafton in the couple's Entry of License for marriage, but "Anne Hathwey" of Stratford in the Bond of Sureties.[1] Though it is difficult to explain the circumstance of the records, it is at least certain that Anne Hathaway was the correct maiden name of the bride, and it is possible also to identify which Hathaway family she came from. There are at least six relevant points on the subject:

(1) Nicholas Rowe, Shakespeare's first major biographer, says that Shakespeare's wife "was the Daughter of one *Hathaway*, said to have been a substantial Yeoman in the Neighbourhood of *Stratford*."[2]
(2) In September 1566, Shakespeare's father John stood surety for a Richard Hathaway in two separate actions in the Court of Record.[3] Halliwell-Phillipps, who quotes the cases, does not note any record of Richard's place of residence.
(3) The sureties in the Bond of Sureties for Shakespeare's marriage are named as Fulke Sandells and John Richardson of Stratford. On 1st September 1581, a Richard Hathaway of Shottery made a will in which Fulke Sandells was what would now be called his trustee (one of two), and in which John Richardson was a witness.[4]
(4) This Richard Hathaway of Shottery also left a sheep and some money to his daughter Agnes.[5] The name Agnes is conclusively shown by Chambers to have been interchangeable for Anne.[6]
(5) One of Richard Hathaway's shepherds, Thomas Whittington, bequeathed some money to the poor people of Stratford in his will in 1601. The money is said by Whittington to be in the hand of "Anne Shaxspere, wyf unto M^{r} Wyllyam Shaxspere, and is due debt unto me."[7]
(6) Bartholomew Hathaway, the son of Richard and either the brother or the half-brother of Anne, names Shakespeare's son-in-law John Hall as the overseer of his will in 1621.[8]

Though these points are cumulatively strong, Chambers does note a strange series of absences of evidence. Shakespeare, for example, does not mention any of the Hathaway family in his will. Nobody, moreover, closely related to Richard Hathaway has anything to do with the Shakespeare estates subsequently, and yet there *are* other people named Hathaway involved.[9] This problem is most likely to be resolved not by looking for the bride from another family, but instead by examining this family's dynamics: Chambers, for example, suggested that religion may have played a part in dividing the family, though there is little evidence to support this.

[1] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.70. EKC F&P2, p.41. [2] Rowe, Nicholas (ed.) (1709). The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. Vol. 1. Some Account of the Life, &c. of Mr. William Shakespeare. p.v. Original via the Gale Shakespeare Collection. [3] HP O2, pp.227–230. [4] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.67. Cf. SS CDL, pp.78–9. [5] EKC F&P2, p.49. [6] EKC F&P2, p.49, plus his many references, and SS CDL, p.81. [7] EKC F&P2, p.42. [8] EKC F&P2, p.49. [9] EKC F&P2, pp.50–1.

17th June 1556 — John Shakespeare is identified as a glover in a suit brought against him by Thomas Siche of Armscote.

[*] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.28.

September 1556 — John Shakespeare is chosen as a town aletaster and assizer, one of two whose duties were to check the quality of the town's bread and ale.

[*] SS CDL, p.33, though there is no notice of this in HP O2, pp.215–6. Perhaps the appointments to aletaster were always made on Michaelmas. Elton, Charles Isaac (1904). William Shakespeare: His Family and Friends. p.78 and Honan, p.8 for the duties.

2nd October 1556 — John Shakespeare buys two properties in Stratford, one on Greenhill Street and one on Henley Street.

§ After observing that John Shakespeare bought a Greenhill Street property "with a garden and croft" on this date, Halliwell-Phillipps observes that this property was "sold by him at some unascertained period before 1590".[1] Robert Bearman suggests more specifically that it was sold in the 1578–9 period when John attempted to mortgage and sell both property and estate gained from his marriage to Mary Arden.[2] Eccles says that the tenants of the Greenhill Street property are unknown, but that the

borough tenants in the street were poor.[3] John Shakespeare bought the property from George Turnor, who is described by Fullom as a burgess and a publican.[4] Eccles notes that a George Turnour had bought eight houses, four tofts (plots), and four acres in Stratford in 1502 for a hundred silver marks, and that these might have included John Shakespeare's later purchase.[5] A further possible tenuous connection between John Shakespeare and a George Turnour or Turner exists in that someone of the latter name sought the hand in marriage of the widow of Dr. Bentley, an owner of New Place, whose will had been executed by Adrian Quiney, one of John Shakespeare's friends.[6] Greenhill Street is now known as More Town Street.[7]

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, James Orchard (1888). New Evidences in Confirmation of the Traditional Recognition of Shakespeare's Birth-Room. p.12. [2] Bearman, Robert (2005). John Shakespeare: A Papist or Just Penniless? Shakespeare Quarterly, 56.4. p.417. [3] Eccles, p.45. [4] Fullom, Stephen Watson (1864). History of William Shakespeare, Player and Poet. p.14. [5] Eccles, p.24. [6] Fripp, Edgar Innes (1924). Master Richard Quyny. p.17. Fripp records the name as "George Turner", though "Turner" is interchangeable with "Turnor". [7] Kay, Dennis (1992). Shakespeare: His Life, Work and Era. p.12.

24th November 1556 — Robert Arden, William's maternal grandfather, makes his will.

* Eccles, p.17 & p.25.

9th December 1556 — Robert Arden had recently died, and an inventory of his goods is taken.

* Eccles, p.18.

1557

30th April 1557 — John Shakespeare is marked to serve on a court leet jury but does not attend, perhaps due to making marriage preparations.

§ Malone says that on "April 30, 1556" he finds John to be "one of the jury of the court leet".[1] Collier gives the same date and says that John's name is cancelled, with "stet" written in by his name,[2] which means that his name was cancelled by mistake. This detail is not in Malone, so presumably Collier saw the document too or got his information from someone who did. Yet in Halliwell-Phillipps's detailed annals of John Shakespeare, the date is given as 30th April 1557.[3] Since the 30th April is after Lady Day, the confusion cannot have been due to the two different reckonings of the new year. Neither Malone nor Halliwell-Phillipps mentions the other's date, so it is unlikely that there are two different records and that John was meant to attend the jury on the same day of both years.[4] The date of John's intended jury service is important to determine not only because it bears on the question of his rise to civic eminence, but because if a dating to 1557 were certain then it would contribute as evidence towards the dating of his marriage.

The original manuscript is presently in the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Records Office, which I contacted for assistance. Mairi Macdonald noted in response that "the View of Frankpledge is dated 'ultimo die Aprilis Annis Regnorum Philippi et Marie ... Tercio & quarto' which ran from 25 July 1556 to 5 July 1557".[5] The View of Frankpledge was a proceeding of the court leet, and a kind of synonym for it.[6] The *Handbook of British Chronology* says that "Mary reckoned the 2nd year of her reign from 6 July 1554, thus ignoring the reign of Q. Jane. Philip, though not crowned k. of England, was styled k. and his regnal years begin on 25 July."[7] The 6th July 1553 that marks the start of Mary's reign was the death of her predecessor, Edward VI; and the 25th July 1554 that marks the start of Philip's styling as king is from his marriage to Mary on that day. Hence this entry is dated to the ultimo day, the 30th, of April in 1557. In other words, Halliwell-Phillipps was correct.

This does not explain why Malone and Collier made their mistakes. Collier may have just been following Malone on the dating and not checked carefully. Perhaps Malone saw "Tercio" and this prompted him to remember it as 3. M. rather than 3 & 4 Ph. & M.? Or perhaps he made his notes correctly but his publisher made the error?

[1] Malone, Edmond (1821). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Boswell Jr., James (ed.). Vol. 2. p.74. [2] Collier, John Payne (1853b). The Works of Shakespeare. Vol. 1. p.xlix. [3] HP O2, p.215. [4] 30th April 1556 was a Thursday, and 30th April 1556 was a Friday, so there is no indication that can be derived from one of the dates being a Sunday, for example. [5] Macdonald, Mairi (2009). Pers. comm., 21st April 2009. [6] Ritson, Joseph (1809). The Jurisdiction of the Court Leet. pp.v–vii. [7] Fryde, E. B., et al. (1986). The Handbook of British Chronology. p.43. If Malone had not ignored the reign of Queen Jane, this still would not have accounted for the error.

c.May 1557 — John Shakespeare and Mary Arden are married.

§ Chambers estimates the year of the marriage by reasoning that since Robert Arden made his will on 24th November 1556, and the couple's first child Joan Shakespeare was born just before 15th September 1558, they must have been married in that period.[1] If the purchases of 2nd October were in preparation for the marriage, it is more likely than not that the marriage took place before Joan's conception in around December 1557,[2] which therefore limits the range of the ceremony to roughly October 1556 to January 1558.

The date may be narrowed down more precisely through an inference from the Borough records. Fripp says it is worth observing that John was "fined on June 2 [1557] for having failed to attend as Taster at three consecutive sittings of the Court of Record. This is unlike an aspirant to Borough honours, and very unlike what we know of John Shakespeare at this period. He was probably engaged in things matrimonial and other private affairs."[3] That John did not attend a court leet jury of 30th April 1557 may also indicate that he was busy with marriage preparations.[4] Susanna Shakespeare and Elizabeth Hall, William's daughter and granddaughter, both married on 5th June,[5] and perhaps this date was a family tradition for marriage started by John and Mary. The weight of the documentary evidence, however, suggests a May date for the ceremony.

[1] EKC F&P2, p.xvi. [2] The situation of William and Anne's first child Susanna is a well known counterexample. [3] Fripp, Edgar Innes (1920). Among the Shakespeare Archives. Notes and Queries, 12.7. p.342. [4] HP O2, p.216, and cf. 30th April 1557. [5] See 5th June 1607 (Susanna), and 5th June 1649 (Elizabeth).

§ John and Mary's wedding ceremony likely took place in Aston Cantlow, the parish of the bride, where her father had recently asked to be buried. Schoenbaum notes that the marriage registers there start later than 1557, and that "probably for that reason there is no record of John Shakespeare's marriage."[1]

[1] All from SS CDL, p.22.

1558

1558 — John Shakespeare is elected a town burgess.

§ The Company of Stratford, the town council, was made up of fourteen burgesses or lower council members, and fourteen aldermen or upper council members.[1] From the burgesses were generally chosen the constables and town chamberlains,[2] and from the aldermen were chosen the bailiff, who acted like a town mayor, and his deputy the chief alderman.[3] When John was elected a town burgess, he therefore entered into the administrative organisation of the town, and gained a trusted position of civic responsibility and merit.

[1] Knight, Charles (1854). The Stratford Shakspere. Vol. 1. p.9. [2] Chamberlains by inference from John having been a bailiff when he was chosen to be chamberlain, and constables from Knight, Charles (1854). The Stratford Shakspere. Vol. 1. p.9. [3] Fripp, Edgar Innes (1928). Shakespeare's Stratford. p.x.

15th September 1558 — Joan Shakespeare, first child of John and Mary, is baptised.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.22. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.1, Eccles, p.25.

30th September 1558 — John Shakespeare serves on a court leet jury, and is also ordained a town constable.

* Facsimile of the constabulary record in SS DL, p.29. Cf. HP O2, p.218.

1559

6th October 1559 — John Shakespeare is once again ordained a town constable, and is sworn in as an affeeror.

* HP O2, p.219. An affeeror is one who sets the amount of an amercement, a penalty levied on a discretionary basis.

1561

January 1561 — John Bretchgirdle, who probably baptised Shakespeare, is appointed the new vicar of Holy Trinity in Stratford.

* McCoy, Richard C. (2003). Shakespearean Tragedy and Religious Identity. In: Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (eds.). A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Vol. 1. p.180. Cf. Eccles, p.38 on Bretchgirdle baptising Shakespeare.

10th February 1561 — Richard Shakespeare had recently died, and administration of his estate is granted to his son John Shakespeare, who was probably John the poet's father.

* Eccles, p.9.

4th May 1561 — John Shakespeare witnesses the court leet.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.30.

29th September 1561 — John Shakespeare is elected town chamberlain for the first time.

* HP O2, p.219.

1st October 1561 — John Shakespeare, probably John the poet's father, is fined twelvepence for neglecting his hedges in Snitterfield.

* Eccles, p.8. Not in HP O2.

1562

29th September 1562 — John Shakespeare is elected town chamberlain for the second time.

* HP O2, p.219.

2nd December 1562 — Margaret Shakespeare, second child of John and Mary, is baptised.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.22. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.1, Eccles, p.26.

1563

24th January 1563 — John Taylor and John Shakespeare make the town chamberlain accounts.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.30.

30th April 1563 — Margaret Shakespeare is buried.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.22. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.1, Eccles, p.26.

29th September 1563 — John Shakespeare is elected town chamberlain for the third time, presumably on Michaelmas Day though the account of this election is missing.

* Eccles, p.26 says that he served as chamberlain with John Taylor from 1561 to 1563, presumably 1563 being inclusive. Compare HP O2, p.219 for Michaelmas elections.

1564

10th January 1564 — John Shakespeare prepares the chamberlain accounts with his fellow chamberlain John Taylor.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.31. Cf. HP O2, pp.221–4.

22nd April 1564 — William Shakespeare, third child of John and Mary, is born.

§ There are several points of evidence indicative of the date of Shakespeare's birth. These are that (a) he was baptised on the 26th April; (b) the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer* advises people to baptise before the next Sunday or Holy Day; (c) the 19th was the Holy Day of Alphege; (d) the 23rd was a Sunday; (e) the 25th was St. Mark's Day, but was considered unlucky and not a popular day on which to baptise; (f) Shakespeare's Stratford monument may imply that he could have been born no later than 23rd April 1564 as he was "aetatis 53" when he died on 23rd April 1616.[1] Oldys reported in or after 1691 that Shakespeare's date of birth was the 23rd April, but he also had the year wrong.[2] He may have conflated Shakespeare date of birth with the day on which he died. Since the day reported by Oldys is also St. George's Day, the convenient alignment of national patron with national playwright has kept the date that he reports fashionable.

On the evidence outlined above, if point (f) derived from Shakespeare's Stratford monument does not hold, then Shakespeare was most likely born on the 24th or 25th. But the monument is carved in stone in Holy Trinity in Stratford, and details such as his age were presumably carved with some care. If so, then Shakespeare was more likely born between the 20th, due to point (c), and the 23rd, due to point (f), inclusive.[3] Chambers was realistic about the evidence in 1930 when he said "There does not seem to me to be enough material for an opinion as to the exact birth-date."[4] But that has not stopped people from making informed guesses, and one guess, by Thomas de Quincey, has turned out to be particularly well informed.

"One only argument has sometimes struck us for supposing that the 22d might be the day, and not the 23d; which is, that Shakspeare's sole grand-daughter, Lady Barnard, was married on the 22d of April, 1626, ten years exactly from the poet's death; and the reason for choosing this day *might* have had a reference to her illustrious grandfather's birthday; which, there is good reason for thinking, would be celebrated as a festival in the family for generations."[5]

De Quincey could perhaps have added that were Shakespeare born on the 23rd, it would be quite unusual that she and her husband chose 22nd on which to be married. If De Quincey's conjecture is accurate, then perhaps 5th June is a significant date for the Shakespeare family too. It has previously eluded attention that both Susanna Shakespeare, and Elizabeth in her second marriage, were married on that date.[6] That Elizabeth's first marriage should indicate the date of Shakespeare's birth is bolstered strongly by the recognition that Elizabeth chose to honour her mother's wedding anniversary for her own second marriage. This may add enough credence to De Quincey's conjecture to push it across the threshold of reasonability.[7]

[1] SS CDL, pp.24–5. [2] SS CDL, p.24. Oldys says 23rd April 1563. [3] Schoenbaum gives the 21st to 23rd as the available range; it is not clear why he omits the 20th. [4] EKC F&P2, p.2. [5] De Quincey, Thomas (1842). Shakespeare. In: the Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. 20. 7th edition. p.169. Also printed in De Quincey, Thomas (1851). Biographical Essays. p.9. [6] Cf. 5th June 1607 (Susanna), and e.g. Adams, Joseph Quincy (1923). A Life of William Shakespeare. p.484 for 5th June 1649 (Elizabeth). [7] De Quincey's conjecture alone was enough to convince Halliwell-Phillipps of this date, who says in HP O2, p.332 that "few things are more likely than the selection of her grandfather's birthday for such a celebration", amongst other discussion of the matter.

26th April 1564 — William Shakespeare is baptised.

* Facsimile of the baptismal register page in SS DL, p.21. EKC F&P2, p.1, Eccles, p.26.

July 1564 — Plague sweeps through Stratford.

* SS CDL, p.26.

27th September 1564 — John Shakespeare witnesses a corporation order.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.33.

20th December 1564 — John Shakespeare attends a corporation meeting.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.33.

1565

15th February 1565 — John Shakespeare makes the chamberlains' accounts.

* HP O2, p.227.

4th July 1565 — John Shakespeare is elected a town alderman.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.34. Cf. HP O2, p.227, Eccles, p.27.

12th September 1565 — John Shakespeare is sworn in as an alderman.

* HP O2, p.227.

1566

15th February 1566 — John Shakespeare makes the chamberlain account of William Tyler and William Smith.

* Facsimile of the first page of the record in SS DL, p.32.

13th October 1566 — Gilbert Shakespeare, fourth child of John and Mary, is baptised.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.22. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.2, and Eccles, p.26.

§ Gilbert was described as a haberdasher in 1597 when he put up £19 of bail for Stratford clockmaker William Sampson in London. All known subsequent events of his life are set in Stratford. In 1602 he conveyed a property deed for William, and in 1609 he was engaged in a lawsuit. A lease that he signed on 5th March 1610 shows that he wrote with a competent italian hand. He was buried on 3rd February 1612 (q.v.), described as "adolescens", or single.[1] The bail that he put up in 1597 is a considerable sum, roughly equivalent to a year's pay for a schoolmaster.[2]

[1] All distilled from Eccles, pp.107–9. [2] SS CDL, p.65 and Honan, p.51 both give £20 as the Stratford Grammar schoolmaster's annual pay. Orme, Nicholas (2006). Medieval Schools. p.326 notes that this was a standard amount, not limited to Stratford, for the middle of the 16th century.

1567

3rd September 1567 — John Shakespeare is nominated to be town bailiff, the name for the equivalent position of mayor, and is not chosen.

* HP O2, p.230. He would go on to be elected bailiff the next year, cf. 4th September 1568.

1568

4th September 1568 — John Shakespeare is elected town bailiff, the equivalent of a modern mayor.

* Facsimile of the candidate list in SS DL, p.34. Cooper, Tarnya (ed.) (2006). Searching for Shakespeare. p.147 gives a colour reproduction of the manuscript, SBTRO "BRU 2/1, p.368".

§ The position of high bailiff was the highest civic position in the Corporation of Stratford or the town council. The bearer of this office also took on the positions of justice of the peace, the Queen's chief officer, and became a judge of the Court of Record.[1]

[1] Eccles, p.27. Also mentioned in part by Wheler, Robert Bell (1814). A Guide to Stratford-upon-Avon. p.10.

1st October 1568 — John Shakespeare is sworn in as bailiff.

* HP O2, pp.230–1.

4th November 1568 — John Shakespeare allegedly sells John Walford, of Marlborough in Wiltshire, twenty-one tods of wool.

§ One tod of wool was equal to 28lb avoirdupois.[1] Twenty-one tods was therefore 588lb, or nearly a third of a ton imperial, and just over a quarter of a tonne metric; this was dealing on a considerable commercial scale. An Act of Parliament in 1553 had made it illegal for the majority of people, John included, to sell wool, an activity which once illegal became known as brogging, but this act was not rigorously enforced until the late 1570s.[2] After the late 1570s the government became less and less interested in enforcing the act.[3]

This may however explain why John did not pursue Walford for debt over this deal until 1599. The original deal, John alleged, had been a £21 pay-on-demand sum for the wool. Given that John went through a considerable financial crisis starting in around 1576,[4] this is when he would be most likely to attempt to retrieve old debt;

but this is also when enforcement against wool dealing was at its peak, and so John could hardly have claimed against Walford through the courts in the period when he most needed to. In 1599, though, such action was apparently acceptable, and Walford was called to appear in court in 29th December 1599 to answer the charge. The docket with the contents for a subsequent plea roll shows that further details about the case were recorded, but unfortunately the plea roll itself along with the details has been lost.[5]

It would be interesting to know whether John only started to sell wool after he became town bailiff, with the possible implication that his power in the town allowed him to do so without fear of reprisal. That the first known sale comes only one month after John being sworn in is perhaps indicative of this, but a coincidence in the dates can not be ruled out. We also do not know for sure how many other deals he had, and of what scale they were. This particular deal was only recorded and discovered because Walford had allegedly not paid, so there could have been many other deals where the purchaser did give the required sum. It is strange that John did not pursue Walford for the debt in, for example, the 1580s when the authorities started to become less keen in enforcing measures against brogging. Perhaps they had kept enough pressure up to make it unwise to claim about the issue in court until the end of the century.

[1] Zupko, Ronald Edward (1985). A Dictionary of Weights and Measures for the British Isles. p.415. There were some regional variations on this general measure, Warwickshire not however listed amongst them. [2] Honan, pp.37–40. [3] Bearman, Robert (2005). John Shakespeare: A Papist or Just Penniless? Shakespeare Quarterly, 56.4. pp.424–5. [4] Q.v. 1577, when John starts missing council meetings. [5] All from Hotson, Leslie (1949). Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated. p.232, who discovered the case.

1569

April 1569 — Shakespeare turns five years old, and probably starts at the petty school in Stratford in either this year of his life or the one preceding.

§ When Elizabeth came to the throne only around a fifth of men were literate, but due to educational reform this had risen to around a third by 1600.[1] There is nothing to indicate that John Shakespeare was particularly literate: we have no samples of writing from him, and Honan believes that he may have been able to read but not write.[2] Since John would also have been busy with his professional activities, it is unlikely that he would have taught William at home.[3] More than likely, he enrolled William in the nearby petty school instead, a kind of primary school where the students learned to read and write,[4] to prepare them for grammar school. The Stratford petty school was in fact adjoined to the grammar school itself.[5]

[1] Singman, Jeffrey L. (1995). Daily Life in Elizabethan England. p.42. [2] Honan, pp.8–9, who points out that the lack of writing from John. [3] Wood, Michael (2003). Shakespeare. p.47 is one of the few to be cautious in this regard, saying that William "would have begun his tuition at home, or at petty school". [4] Singman, Jeffrey L. (1995). Daily Life in Elizabethan England. p.42. [5] Hager, Alan (2004). The Age of Milton. p.297.

§ There are numerous suggestions as to when Shakespeare would have started at petty school. Roma Gill says that he would have started aged four.[1] Jonathan Bate and Alan Hager say at age four or five.[2] Baynes, Bradbrook, and Pearce say five.[3] Their sources are not given, and the matter is not a primary subject of investigation in any of these authors. One piece of evidence in this connection is a 1588 book by William Kempe about educating children, wherein Kempe says that he would have children start at petty school at about age five.[4] Whether this affirmed current practice or was intended to change or solidify current practice is, however, not indicated in that work. Probably it was one of the latter, because the educator Francis Clement had said, in 1576, that though a child "be but foure yeares of age, yet at the least let him learne to discerne the vowels from the consonants, and with all, in spelling, to obserue the rule of leauing the consonant comming before a vowel."[5] Bate and Hager are probably

right, on this basis, to say four or five, with perhaps a slight preference for five based on Kempe's reference.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2001a). A Midsummer Night's Dream. Gill, Roma (ed.), Oxford School Shakespeare. p.94. [2] Bate, Jonathan (1993). Shakespeare and Ovid. p.19 and Hager, Alan (2004). The Age of Milton. p.297. [3] Baynes, Thomas Spencer (1896). Shakespeare Studies and Essay on English Dictionaries. p.150, Bradbrook, Muriel Clara (1978). Shakespeare. p.11, and Pearce, Joseph (2008). The Quest for Shakespeare. p.59. [4] Kempe, William (1588). The Education of Children in Learning. EEBO, STC 14926. Sig.E4v. Mentioned in Dolven, Jeffrey Andrew (2007). Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance. p.20. [5] Clement, Francis (1587). The Petie Schole with an English Orthographie. EEBO, STC 5400. p.7, British Library copy. The preface in which this quote appears is dated "21.of Iuly. 1576". Hoole, Charles (1661). A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole. EEBO, Wing H2688. pp.1–2 says that "it is usual in Cities and greater Towns to put children to Schoole about four or five years of age, and in Country villages, because of further distance, not till about six or seven"; but this does not even reveal whether he refers to petty or grammar school in the latter case.

15th April 1569 — Joan Shakespeare, fifth child of John and Mary, is baptised.

[*] Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.22. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.2.

21st October 1569 — John Shakespeare had allegedly loaned £100 to John Musshem of Walton, and Anthony Harrison informs the authorities of the illegal activity.

§ The loan had taken place, according to Harrison, within the year prior to the accusation, so it had conceivably taken place in the same period as the Walford deal.[1] The sum was to be repaid by 1st November 1569, along with £20 interest.[2] Though loans at interest were illegal, no further action was taken in this particular case, perhaps because it was settled out of court.[3] The hamlet of Walton where Musshem came from is about five miles east of Stratford, and the town of Evesham in Worcestershire where Harrison came from is about ten miles south west of Stratford.[4] This was not the only case where John Shakespeare and Musshem were informed against: just a few days later, John was charged with having lent Musshem £80 at another £20 interest.[5]

[1] Cf. 4th November 1568. [2] EKC F&P2, p.139 records an epitaph on John Combe where Combe is said to have lent money at "Ten in the hundred", i.e. at 10% interest, which is described in 1618 as having reflected Combe's usury. Eccles, p.119 says that 10% was the usual level of interest, and if

lending at 10% was considered a usury slur, 20% interest must have been considerable. Musshem must have urgently required the money. [3] Thomas, D. L. and Evans, N. E. (1984). John Shakespeare in The Exchequer. Shakespeare Quarterly, 35.3. p.315. [4] Ordnance Survey maps. This is an example of people further away than John Shakespeare of Clifford Chambers dealing with people in Stratford, cf. c.1530 commentary on John Shakespeare. [5] Thomas, D. L. and Evans, N. E. (1984). John Shakespeare in The Exchequer. Shakespeare Quarterly, 35.3. p.315. Cf. 25th October 1569.

25th October 1569 — John Shakespeare had allegedly loaned £80 to John Musshem of Walton, and James Langrake informs the authorities of the illegal activity.

* Thomas, D. L. and Evans, N. E. (1984). John Shakespeare in The Exchequer. Shakespeare Quarterly, 35.3. p.315.

December 1569 — Walter Roche, a graduate of Corpus Christi at Oxford, takes over from John Acton as master of the King's New School, Stratford's free grammar school.

* Mutschmannm, Heinrich and Wentersdorf, Karl P. (1952). Shakespeare and Catholicism. p.77.

1570

11th December 1570 — John Shakespeare is recorded as being in possession of 14 acres of land in Ingon, between Stratford and Snitterfield.

* EKC F&P2, p.16.

1571

c.1571 — William Shakespeare, now aged seven, was probably enrolled by his father in the lower school of the King's New School in Stratford.

* Anders, Henry R. D. (1904). Shakespeare's Books. p.8, who says enrolled at the age of six or seven, cf. April 1569.

26th February 1571 — John Shakespeare illegally bought 200 tods of wool from Walter Newsam and others on or after this date.

* Thomas, D. L. and Evans, N. E. (1984). John Shakespeare in The Exchequer. Shakespeare Quarterly, 35.3. p.317.

1st September 1571 — John Shakespeare illegally bought 100 tods of wool from Edward and Richard Grant amongst others in Snitterfield.

* Thomas, D. L. and Evans, N. E. (1984). John Shakespeare in The Exchequer. Shakespeare Quarterly, 35.3. p.317.

5th September 1571 — John Shakespeare is elected chief alderman.

* Facsimile of his attendance at the corporation meeting in SS DL, p.35.

§ The chief alderman served as deputy to the town bailiff, who in this year was Adrian Quiney.[1] Amongst other duties, John would have been responsible for administrative control of the local militia.[2]

[1] SS CDL, p.37. [2] Shakespeare, William (1940). The Second Part of Henry the Fourth. Vol. 23, Part 2. Shaaber, Matthias A. (ed.), Lippincott Variorum. p.248.

28th September 1571 — Anne Shakespeare, sixth child of John and Mary, is baptised.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.22. EKC F&P2, p.2.

29th October 1571 — Simon Hunt, a graduate of St. John's at Oxford, is licensed to take over from Walter Roche as master of the King's New School in Stratford.

* Eccles, p.55.

1572

18th January 1572 — John Shakespeare and Adrian Quiney, the bailiff, are asked to go to London on town business.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.35. Cf. HP O2, p.232.

1574

c.1574 — Shakespeare moves from lower to upper school at the King's New School in Stratford.

* SS CDL, p.70 says 1574 or 1575.

11th March 1574 — Richard Shakespeare, seventh child of John and Mary, is baptised.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.22. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.2.

1575

1575 — Thomas Jenkins, a graduate of St. John's at Oxford, takes over from Simon Hunt as master of the King's New School in Stratford.

* SS CDL, p.66.

1575 — John Hall, later to marry Shakespeare's eldest daughter, is born.

* Joseph, Harriet (1976). John Hall: Man and Physician. p.1.

October 1575 — John Shakespeare buys two houses with gardens and orchards in Stratford.

* HP O2, p.233.

1576

c.1576 — John Shakespeare makes an application for a Coat of Arms, the process of which was not pursued through to completion.

* Cf. 20th October 1596.

28th November 1576 — The buying of wool was forbidden by royal proclamation for a period of eleven months.

* Youngs, Frederic A. (1976). The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens. p.131.

1577

1577 — John Shakespeare starts not to attend town council meetings, probably the first sign of his financial difficulties.

§ John had been able to purchase two houses in October 1575, which later he rented out.[1] Since he was able to rent them out, the purchase transactions must have been completed, and he is very likely therefore to have had the capital to pay for them. Yet just over a year later he misses council meetings on 23rd January, 8th May, and 24th July 1577,[2] half of the six recorded meetings that year, and he may have missed others where attendances are not noted. This is highly uncharacteristic of John, who had an exemplary record of civic service up until this year. Then on 29th January 1578 there is the first example of the council giving John a financial concession. The pattern of non-attendances and skipped civic duties continues, so that the two are apparently linked together; perhaps he was afraid that if he attended council meetings he would be processed for debt? But in that case why turn up for some of them? Since John was making large purchases in 1575, showed up to meetings in 1576, stopped attending in 1577, and then was given concessions in 1578, the most likely point where the difficulties started is late 1576. Perhaps, as Bearman argues,[3] it is not coincidental that the dealing in wool that John had been engaged in was being strongly enforced against from 28th November 1576.

[1] SS CDL, p.23. [2] HP O2, p.233. [3] Bearman, Robert (2005). John Shakespeare: A Papist or Just Penniless? Shakespeare Quarterly, 56.4. pp.411–33.

31st May 1577 — Bonds of £100 are required from all illegal wool dealers as a security against their dealing in wool.

[*] Saunders, H. W. (ed.) (1915). The Official Papers of Nathanial Bacon. pp.160–1, "And to take of them bondes to hir Ma^{ties} use in the some of one C^{li} that they shall not bie or bargaine anie manno^{r} of Wolles that shall growe in the said shire or in anie other, but onelie suche quantyties as they by them selves and ther Apprentices shall yerelie make or do to be maid and wrought in ther [?] howses in thinges used to be maid of wolle and mixed wth wolle wthin this Realme. And further they shall not buye anie to sell the same backe in whole againe to anie other."

4th October 1577 — John Shakespeare attends his last recorded town council meeting for many years.

§ There were six recorded council meetings in this year. John had been absent from the three meetings prior to October, on the 23rd January, 8th May, and 24th July. He was then marked as present for the 4th October meeting. The registers for 6th November and 4th December do not record attendances.[1] It is not therefore certain that this was his last actual attendance. It is a shame that the November and December meetings do not record this information because it would be interesting to know whether he only missed the first half of the year, or whether he missed all of the meetings apart from one. If he only attended the one meeting, perhaps there was something that caused him to *go* to the meeting, something important about the meeting itself. If he missed half the year, perhaps it is more likely that something caused him to *stay away* from those meetings, something most likely external to the meetings themselves.

[1] HP O2, pp.233, 235.

1578

c.1578 — Shakespeare leaves or had already left the King's New School in Stratford.

§ Based on evidence of matriculation of Stratford boys at Oxford, Baldwin found that the students at Stratford may have left as early as fourteen years old or as late as eighteen.[1] The guess of 1578 when Shakespeare was fourteen, or perhaps even earlier, is influenced by Rowe, who states of Shakespeare at the "Free-School" that "the narrowness of his Circumstances, and the want of his assistance at Home, forc'd his Father to withdraw him from thence, and unhappily prevented his further Proficiency in that Language".[2] John Shakespeare's financial troubles seem to have started in 1577 or 1578 (q.v. 4th October 1577 and 29th January 1578). If the troubles had come a few years earlier or a few years later, this would have been inconsistent with Rowe's statement. Though the correlation does not prove that Rowe was accurate, it is notable that Rowe should place correctly the start of the only known poor financial period in the fortunes of either John or William.

[1] Baldwin, T. W. (1944). William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke. Vol. 1. p.487–8. [2] Rowe, Nicholas (ed.) (1709). The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. Vol. 1. Some Account of the Life, &c. of Mr. William Shakespeare. pp.ii–iii. Original via the Gale Shakespeare Collection.

29th January 1578 — The town council make a financial concession to John Shakespeare, allowing him to pay the burgess, rather than the much steeper alderman, rate of pikeman tax.

[*] HP O2, p.235.

12th November 1578 — John and Mary Shakespeare, and George Gibbes, convey land to Thomas Webbe and Humphrey Hooper, who grant Gibbes a lease.

§ The land in Wilmcote was transferred from John, Mary, and George to Thomas and Humphrey,[1] until 1601 when the land was to revert to John and Mary;[2] and in that time George was to rent the land from Thomas and Humphrey, paying a nominal or peppercorn rent in wheat and barley. As Chambers observes, the peppercorn rent "suggests that Gibbes had paid a sum down for his interest."[3] The exact nature and

purpose of this conveyance is debated, and there does not appear to be any clear consensus. That there is some kind of link to the mortgaging which takes place two days later, at least, seems quite clear: John and Mary must have needed a large amount of money quite quickly. Eccles thinks only that Gibbes was renewing an existing lease.[4]

[1] EKC F&P2, p.38. [2] Eccles, p.30. [3] EKC F&P2, p.38. [4] Eccles, p.30.

14th November 1578 — John Shakespeare mortgages a house and land to his wife's brother-in-law Edmund Lambert.

§ Robert Bearman thinks that the 1597 allegation by John Lambert, Edmund's son, that John Shakespeare brought an action because his lease was nearing its end suggests that the lands in that deal were the same as those mortgaged to Edmund.[1]

[1] Bearman, Robert (2005). John Shakespeare: A Papist or Just Penniless? Shakespeare Quarterly, 56.4. p.416.

19th November 1578 — John Shakespeare is excused charity payments.

[*] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.37. Cf. HP O2, p.235.

1579

4th April 1579 — Anne Shakespeare is buried.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.23. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.2.

28th September 1579 — John Cottam, a graduate of Brasenose at Oxford, takes over from Thomas Jenkins as master of the King's New School in Stratford.

* Dobson, Michael and Wells, Stanley W. (2001). The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare. p.93.

15th October 1579 — John and Mary Shaksepeare sell shares in land, and two Snitterfield houses, to Robert Webbe.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.38. Cf. HP O2, p.236.

1580

3rd May 1580 — Edmund Shakespeare, eighth and last child of John and Mary, is baptised.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.22. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.2.

29th December 1580 — Agnes Arden, Mary Shakespeare's step-mother, is buried in the parish of Aston Cantlow.

* Eccles, p.18.

1581

1st September 1581 — Richard Hathaway, father of Anne Hathaway, makes his will.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.67. Eccles, p.63 & p.68.

1582

31st January 1582 — Alexander Aspinall is licensed to take over from John Cottam as master of the King's New School in Stratford.

§ The license for a teacher in Stratford was given with neither the name of the teacher nor the name of the school,[1] but the Michaelmas 1582 records show that both Cottam and Aspinall were remunerated for the period since the previous Michaelmas.[2] Cottam must therefore have left between 29th September 1581 (Michaelmas) and 31st January 1582 when the new license was granted.[3] Fripp suggested that Cottam's departure had something to do with the actions of Thomas Cottam. Thomas was a Catholic priest whom Fripp guessed to be John's younger brother,[4] a guess confirmed many decades later by E. A. J. Honigmann.[5] In June 1580, Thomas was captured by the authorities in England having become a priest on the continent, and though he escaped, he surrendered himself to the authorities again in December of the same year.[6] He was charged with recusancy along with the famous Jesuit priest Edmund Campion on 14th November 1581. The whole affair was notorious and widely reported, and Thomas was executed on 30th May 1582.[7] Recusant schoolmasters were subject to harsh penalties,[8] and there may have been suspicion towards John Cottam during this period.

[1] Gray, Joseph William (1905). Shakespeare's Marriage. p.108, who cites the "Register of Bishop Whitgift, folio 41*b*". [2] Baldwin, T. W. (1944). William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke. Vol. 1. p.481. [3] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1998). Shakespeare: The Lost Years. p.128 says that Cottam resigned in December 1581, but he does not state a source for this exact dating, and this may therefore be a guess. The same information in Greenblatt, Stephen (2004). Will in the World. p.98 appears to derive from Honigmann. [4] Fripp, Edgar Innes (1929). Shakespeare's Haunts near Stratford. pp.31–2, via Baldwin, T. W. (1944). William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke. Vol. 1. p.482. [5] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1998). Shakespeare: The Lost Years. p.41–2, mainly on the basis of signature comparisons on top of much circumstantial evidence. [6] Greenblatt, Stephen (2004). Will in the World. pp.97–8. [7] Baldwin, T. W. (1944). William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke. Vol. 1. p.482. [8] Baldwin, T. W. (1944). William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke. Vol. 1. p.483, citing Leach, Arthur Francis (1911). Educational Charters and Documents 598 to 1909. pp.524–6. This is perhaps the source of SS CDL, p.66.

§ Cottam returned at some point to Tarnacre, his family estate in Lancashire,[1] and was listed there as a Catholic recusant.[2] Tarnacre was close to the seat of the prestigious Houghton family, of whom the Cottams were tenants.[3] One of the Houghtons left money to a William Shakeshafte in 1581,[4] in a will which also mentions a "John Cotham" who may be the schoolmaster.[5] Some scholars, even including Chambers and Schoenbaum,[6] have on the evidence available to them thought it just possible that this Shakeshafte was Shakespeare. In 2002, however, Robert Bearman showed this to be exceptionally unlikely: there were several William Shakeshaftes in the area, and the amount of money given was much higher than Shakespeare would have been expected to receive given his age and standing. Bearman's best argument comes when he compares Shakeshafte's £2 annuity with that of fellow servant Thomas Costen:

"As matters stand at present, we have to decide whether it places less strain on the evidence to opt for Hamer's very reasonable suggestion that the annuities were prorated to take account of age, or at least length of service (thus pushing Shakeshafte into middle age), or to opt for the proposition that Shakeshafte was actually the seventeen-year-old William Shakespeare who, within a matter of months of joining Hoghton's household, had somehow secured for himself more favorable treatment than servants with longer periods of service. Thomas Costen, for example, in the late 1570s, had played the invaluable but risky role of messenger between the exiled Thomas Hoghton and his family in England yet was rewarded with an annuity of only £1."[7]

A response by Honigmann to Bearman, though informative and cogent, attempts to deal with this point only in terms of Shakespeare's geniality and Hoghton's eccentricity, an argument much less convincing.[8] The theory has attracted much special pleading. Despite this, one positive result of the debate is that it has led to the elucidation of some of the details of the close knit and determined Catholic community. Rene Weis has pointed out that even if Shakespeare strongly sympathised with the Catholic plight, he "had no need to follow his former schoolmaster John Cottom to Lancashire — the Catholics were literally on his doorstep in Stratford, and he needed to look no further than Shottery to meet the die-hards."[9] The activities of

Catholics in Warwickshire, Lancashire, and elsewhere certainly deserve further careful investigation.

[1] "He retired in 1582 to Tarnacre in Lancashire", according to Kay, Dennis (1992). Shakespeare: His Life, Work and Era. p.22. Honigmann is the obvious source for this fact, but he does not seem to state that Cottam went straight back to Tarnacre rather than, say, London with which he is also associated. [2] Baldwin, T. W. (1944). William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke. Vol. 1. p.488. [3] Wilson, Richard (2003). Theatre and Religion. Introduction, p.21. [4] EKC ES 1, p.280, a passage from the will dated 3rd August 1581 of Alexander Houghton. Piccope, G. J. (1860). Lancashire and Cheshire Wills and Inventories. 2nd portion. p.237 contains the whole will, proved on 12th September 1581. [5] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1998). Shakespeare: The Lost Years. p.47–8 suggests that this was John Cottam of Tarnacre, the then Stratford schoolmaster. [6] Chambers, E. K. (1944). Shakespearean Gleanings. p.52 and SS CDL, p.112. [7] Bearman, Robert (2002). "Was William Shakespeare William Shakeshafte?" Revisited. Shakespeare Quarterly, 53.1. pp.91–2. [8] Honigmann, E. A. J. (2003). The Shakespeare/Shakeshafte Question, Continued. Shakespeare Quarterly, 54.1. pp.83–6. [9] Weis, René (2008). Shakespeare Revealed. p.49.

c.August 1582 — Susanna Shakespeare, the first child of William and Anne, is conceived.

* Cf. 26th May 1583.

27th November 1582 — Shakespeare and Anne Hathaway's marriage license is entered in the Bishop of Worcester's Register.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.70. Cf. Eccles, p.64. The bride's name is given as "Annam Whateley" in error.

28th November 1582 — Shakespeare and Anne Hathaway's marriage bond is entered in the Bishop of Worcester's Register.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.63. Cf. Eccles, p.64.

1583

26th May 1583 — Susanna Shakespeare, daughter of William and Anne, is baptised.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.76. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.2.

1584

3th November 1584 — Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan who wrote the text of a Spiritual Will and Testament probably used by John Shakespeare, dies.

* Worcester, Thomas (1997). Seventeenth-Century Cultural Discourse. p.177.

§ The spiritual will was discovered in the 18th century, under the rafters of what had been the Shakespeare family's Henley Street residence, by a master bricklayer named Joseph Moseley. He had been repairing the house for the current owner, Thomas Hart.[1] There has long been a suspicion that the spiritual will is a forgery, so it is important to consider carefully the evidence of Moseley's discovery.

On 14th June 1784, John Jordan of Stratford sent a letter to the Gentleman's Magazine enclosing a copy of the spiritual will for publication, and wrote that it had been found by Moseley "some years ago, under the tileing of the house where the poet was born". In October 1787, the vicar of Stratford, James Davenport, wrote to Edmond Malone. Davenport said that according to Stratford alderman John Payton, Moseley had found a small paper book describing John Shakespeare's faith "a few years ago" between the raftering and the tiling. The spiritual will had then been given, without charge, to Payton by Moseley.

Malone enquired further, and Davenport apparently wrote back, according to an undated draft, that Moseley was now deceased, but that Moseley's daughter remembered her father finding it and showing it to their neighbours. The neighbours, Davenport wrote, were enquired of, and they had indeed seen it. This implies that they were shown the document by Moseley. Thomas Hart was also enquired of, and he reported that he had heard Moseley talk of finding it.[2] Malone borrowed the document from Davenport. It was missing its first leaf, but Davenport then sent a notebook belonging to John Jordan which contained the text of the first leaf.[3] Malone studied the document found in the rafters, and in 1790 he published his opinion, saying that he believed it to be genuine:

"The handwriting is undoubtedly not so ancient, as that usually written about the year 1600. but I have now before me a manuscript written by Alleyn the player at various times between 1599 and 1614. and another by Forde, the dramatick poet, in 1606. in nearly the same handwriting as that of the manuscript in question." (Malone, 1790)[4]

[1] SS CDL, p.45. [2] Bearman, Robert (2003). John Shakespeare's "Spiritual Testament": A Reappraisal. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 56. pp.185–6. [3] SS CDL, pp.45–8. [4] Malone, Edmond (1790). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Vol. 1, Part II. pp.161–2. This description makes it sound as though Alleyn used the newer italian handwriting style, but his letter to his wife c.1593, which Malone knew of, is in secretary.

§ In 1795, Malone published a new opinion on the spiritual will. He had found documents which he said disproved its veracity,[1] but he did not print the documents nor give any other details about them. They never transpired, and so we do not know on what grounds Malone dismissed the spiritual will. The new opinion was published as an aside in Malone's famous debunking of William Henry Ireland's Shakespearean forgeries, so perhaps Malone was in a somewhat more skeptical frame of mind than he had been when initially writing about the spiritual will. The spiritual will subsequently went missing, and its whereabouts are still unknown. But this was not the only copy of the will. It was of a generic type, copied out for dissemination throughout the Catholic networks in England, for signing by recusants who wanted to maintain an allegiance to their faith. Another original copy was found in the 20th century, and the text matched what was printed by Malone, with the exception of the first leaf.[2] Jordan must have forged the first leaf, but the rest of the document is either genuine or was copied from a genuine original. This leads to the question of which scenario was more likely.

Moseley received no remuneration for the spiritual will, and it is difficult to discern any other motive for his having forged it. There would have to be a circumstance encompassing Moseley finding an accurate 16th or 17th century spiritual will text, then forging a copy down to the style of the handwriting with enough precision to later fool Malone, and yet not showing it to anybody other than his neighbours, until eventually lending it to Jordan and then giving it away. When Jordan transcribed the

document, he said that he obtained it from Moseley, and later he says that he returned it to Moseley before it was passed on to Payton.[3] Jordan's transcription was rejected by the Gentleman's Magazine,[4] so he received no remuneration there, and he did not keep the original, which we might expect had he forged it himself. But nobody said that Jordan was the first to have the document, and so the only scenario that would account for him forging the whole thing would be that he planted the document in the rafters himself. But then why would he wait several years until becoming involved with it and attempting to have it published?

Though there are many layers of evidence to consider in this case, three things point towards a tentative conclusion. The first is that Moseley is widely reported to have found the document, and nobody ever says anything otherwise, nor is there any plausible scenario for the document being planted shortly before the discovery. The second is that there has not yet been any plausible motive adduced for Moseley forging the document himself. The third is that the handwriting in the document was enough to convince Malone that the document was genuine, so we may conclude that this was not a trivial forgery if it was a forgery at all. Therefore it seems most likely that Moseley did find it, and that there was in the middle of the 18th century a spiritual will in the rafters of the Henley Street residence that had once belonged to the Shakespeare family. The most likely scenario to account for that is simply that John Shakespeare was a Catholic recusant, and that he signed the document and he or someone in his family hid the document in his rafters.

[1] Malone, Edmond (1796). An Inquiry into the Authenticity of Certain Miscellaneous Papers and Legal Instruments. pp.198–9. [2] SS CDL, p.53. [3] Bearman, Robert (2003). John Shakespeare's "Spiritual Testament": A Reappraisal. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 56. pp.187. [4] SS CDL, p.46.

14th January 1584 — Annys Hathaway, Shakespeare's niece, is baptised.

* Fripp M&A1, p.185.

c.May 1584 — Hamnet and Judith Shakespeare, twin son and daughter of William and Anne, are conceived.

* Cf. 2nd February 1585.

1585

2nd February 1585 — Hamnet and Judith Shakespeare are baptised.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.76. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.3.

1586

4th June 1586 — John Shakespeare becomes a surety for his brother Henry, in a case with Nicholas Lane.

* HP O2, pp.238–41.

September 1586 — John Shakespeare is struck off of the aldermanic roll.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.37.

4th September 1586 — Henry Shakespeare, possibly William's uncle, is a pledge for the christening of Henry Townsend in Snitterfield.

* EKC F&P2, p.14.

1587

18th January 1587 — John Shakespeare had stood surety for Henry Shakespeare, but Henry defaulted and Nicholas Lane pursued John for £20 including damages, leading to John's arrest and release on bail.

§ Henry Shakespeare had owed £22 to Nicholas Lane, and it was arranged in June 1586 that Henry would pay Lane £10 of that by the next Michaelmas. John Shakespeare stood surety, and Henry defaulted, so Lane claimed £20 against John including damages. The action resulted in John's arrest, and he was released on bail. Lane's side was presented at court on 1st February (q.v.), and John's side on 1st March. John took the issue to a higher court, and we do not know the outcome of the case. Halliwell-Phillipps, with the agreement of Robert Bearman, suggests that John took the case to a higher court because he knew that he would be ruled against.[1] John is further mentioned in the proceedings of the lawsuit on 25th January, 1st February, 1st March, and 29th March 1587.[2]

[1] All distilled from Bearman, Robert (2005). John Shakespeare: A Papist or Just Penniless? Shakespeare Quarterly, 56.4. p.419, who in turn uses the materials from HP O2, pp.241–3. [2] HP O2, p.242.

§ John's bail was, according to Eccles, obtained from alderman Richard Hill.[1] Stephen Watson Fullom had believed that Richard Hill was "probably a son of John Hill, his wife's step-brother",[2] but perhaps only because he was under the mistaken impression that this man was John's legal representative, whereas the alderman was not a lawyer, rather than just putting up his bail. Richard Hill the alderman was a woollen draper of Stratford who also pursued John Shakespeare for debt on 24th February 1591 (q.v.), and who died in 1593. His tomb is in the south transept of Holy Trinity in Stratford.[3] The only other Richard Hill possibly of John Shakespeare's acquaintance, though unlikely to have been involved here, was the rector of Hampton Lucy whose sister's marriage settlement was overseen by John on 10th October 1596 (q.v.).

[1] Eccles, p.32. He states this directly, citing the Latin transcriptions of the original documents in HP O2, pp.241–3. [2] Fullom, Stephen Watson (1864). History of William Shakespeare, Player and Poet.

pp.236–7. Not being present presumably alludes to the 1st February hearing. [3] Dixon, W. Macneile and Smart, John Semple (1929). Shakespeare Truth and Tradition. pp.38–9.

23rd April 1587 — Edmund Lambert, brother-in-law of Mary Shakespeare, dies.

[1] HP O2, p.270.

1588

1588 — William is mentioned in a suit of Shakespeare vs. Lambert, brought about by his father.

18th July 1588 — Stratford is deluged by a flooded River Avon.

§ "On the 18th day of July 1588, in the morning, there happened about eight of the clock, in Avon, such a sudden flood, as carried away all the hay about Avon. [...] It brake up sundry houses in Warwick town, and carried away their bread, beef, cheese, butter, pots, pans, and provisions, and took away ten carts out of one town, and three wains, with the furniture of Mr. Thomas Lucy, and broke both ends of Stratford Bridge. [...] Three men going over Stratford Bridge, when they came to the middle of the bridge they could not go forward, and then returning presently, could not get back, for the water was so risen; it rose a yard every hour from eight to four, that it came into the parsonage of Welford Orchard, and filled the fish-pool, and took away the sign-post at the Bear" (Welford Parish Register)[1]

[1] Lee, Sidney (1904). Stratford-on-Avon: From the Earliest Times to the Death of Shakespeare. pp.161–2. Welford is just a few miles downriver from Stratford.

1589

26th February 1589 — Thomas Quiney, who would go on to marry Shakespeare's daughter Judith, is baptised.

* SS CDL, p.292, Mitchell, Reg (2007). Tho: Quiney - Gent. p.115.

1590

c.1590 — Shakespeare starts his London career as a playwright.

§ There is a paucity of direct evidence for Shakespeare's activities in London prior to 1592. Despite this, there are three hints from the later evidence which enable the estimation of a date for the start of Shakespeare's dramatic career.[1]

(1) The first possible reference to Shakespeare in the context of the London stage is the notice of a play called *Henry VI* in the accounts diary of Philip Henslowe for 3rd March 1592. Though there are no references to Shakespeare prior to 1592, he is not only mentioned again in this context later in 1592, but it is also possible to associate him with London and the stage every year thereafter. In 1593 and 1594, for example, his work is printed in London by Richard Field, and he had been continuing to write plays. In 1595 and thereafter he is mentioned in accounts of the Lord Chamberlain's Men. The earlier the date is from 1592, the less likely it is that Shakespeare could have been involved with the London stage in some prominent capacity and yet have escaped all surviving notice.

(2) Shakespeare is called an "upstart crow" in *A Groatsworth of Wit*, ostensibly by Robert Greene, in late 1592, and dramatist Henry Chettle says in the same year that he was unfamiliar with Shakespeare before what was ostensibly Greene's denouncement.[2] As Sidney Thomas notes, whether Chettle is lying about being unfamiliar with Shakespeare or not is irrelevant, because it must at least have been a believable lie. Chettle claims that he did not know how upstanding Shakespeare was, and that he had never met him. This too is more unlikely a scenario the longer Shakespeare had been around in London working in the literary scene. Chettle was, however, published himself for the first time in 1592.

(3) Shakespeare wrote 15 plays, and two long narrative poems, between the years 1593 and 1599 inclusive.[3] This is an average of just over two plays or major works per year. Before 1593, as far as it is possible to discern, he most likely wrote five entire plays, two plays in major collaboration, and one play in minor collaboration.

The entire plays and major collaborations are *Taming of the Shrew*, *Titus Andronicus* (in collaboration), *Edward III* (in collaboration), *1 Contention*, *2 Contention*, *Richard III*, and the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. If the two major and one minor collaboration are counted as a single unit of work,[4] then Shakespeare would have written six units of work before 1593. At the average of two per year, this would give 1590 as the start of his career.

[1] Some of this argument is derived from the work of Thomas, Sidney (1988). On the Dating of Shakespeare's Early Plays. Shakespeare Quarterly, 39.2. pp.187–94. Thomas does not settle on these points as the most prominent and important, and his compendium is quite miscellaneous. [2] Cf. 20th September and 8th December 1592. [3] Cf. the individual entries for the writing of each play for arguments about the dates. The plays around the division of the 1590–92 and 1593–99 categories made here are not amongst the most controversial in regards to dating evidence, and indeed the categories were chosen because they provide the least controversial division for the purpose of this point. [4] Shakespeare's share of *1st Henry VI* is probably quite small. His shares in the two major collaborations are much more difficult to discern. It would take only a single unit to push the indication of the start of Shakespare's career back into 1589, and such a date is still very plausible. But it would take three extra units to reach 1588, which seems less likely than either 1590 or 1589; and another three on top of that to reach 1587, which seems very unlikely. Shakespeare would have to be writing at a much slower rate of production than the later average, or producing otherwise unknown work, for that to be plausible.

§ Gary Taylor suggests that Shakespeare was at the start of the 1590s probably only a hired actor and writer, with "no fixed company allegiances".[1] Nicholas Rowe wrote in 1709 that Shakespeare "was receiv'd into the Company then in being, at first in a very mean Rank; But his admirable Wit, and the natural Turn of it to the Stage, soon distinguish'd him, if not as an extraordinary Actor, yet as an excellent Writer."[2] It is not clear what "Rank" means in this context. It could refer to the prestige of an occupation, for example that holding horses for the visitors would be a meaner rank than being an actor; or it could refer to a shade of distinction within a particular occupation, for example being a not very good actor compared to those who took the leading roles.[3] It is far from certain even that Rowe was accurate in his description, and, if he is accurate, how long it would have taken for Shakespeare to reach a less mean rank.

Shakespeare may have started by collaborating with others on plays that either have not survived, or in which Shakespeare's share has gone undetected. He collaborated

on three of the eight works that he was involved with before 1593, and collaborated on other plays too, such as the exceedingly difficult to date *Sir Thomas More*. This play is a good case in point, because the received text exists only in manuscript, and Shakespeare's share in that play was in part palæographically determined from his handwriting. If only a printed edition of the play survived, perhaps set from a fair copy written by a scribe, would we have been able to detect Shakespeare's share, or his involvement at all? The attribution of the various scenes in the known pre-1593 collaborations are also debated. Small contributions that Shakespeare made to texts in the late 1580s may therefore simply have escaped attention. But this is not to say that Shakespeare was an established and important playwright in the 1580s, or that his output was anything but slight.

[1] Taylor, Gary (1995). Shakespeare and Others. Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England, by Leeds Barroll (ed). p.183. [2] Rowe, Nicholas (ed.) (1709). The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. Vol. 1. Some Account of the Life, &c. of Mr. William Shakespeare. p.vi. Original via the Gale Shakespeare Collection. [3] There is a tradition that Shakespeare did indeed hold horses, but the example here is one of an arbitrary occupation that may be held in worse esteem than acting.

§ On 28th June 1688, William Fulman, who had made some notes about Shakespeare, died and his papers were given to Richard Davies who subsequently annotated them.[1] Fulman's notes amounted to a sparse biography of Shakespeare, with the approximate year of his birth, his occupation, and details of his burial monument. Davies then added some much more interesting annotations: the first recorded mentions of the tale that Shakespeare stole deer and rabbits from Sir Thomas Lucy, and that Shakespeare "dyed a papist".[2]

The deer and rabbit stealing tradition has become well known because it fills a gap in the biographical record, and ostensibly explains why Shakespeare left Stratford for London to become an actor and playwright. Including Davies, there are three early sources for the tradition:

(1) The annotations by Davies on Fulman. These must have been made between June 1688 when Davies received the papers, and June 1709 when Davies died.[3]

(2) Nicholas Rowe, who prints the tradition in 1709. His information is said to have come from the actor Betterton.[4] Oldys too calls it "a Tradition descended frō old Betterton that he was drawn into a company of deer Stealers & concernd wth y^{m}. in robbing S^{r} Tho^{s}. Lucy's park at Charlecot w^{ch} drove him to London so among the Players where he became the Great Genius we read him in his Plays";[5] but then Steevens (in 1778) records Oldys as having got his information from an old man in Stratford, whom Capell (in 1780) names as one Thomas Jones from a nearby village.[6]

(3) Joshua Barnes (d.1712) is said to have overheard a couple of stanzas of a song by Shakespeare sung by a woman in an inn in Stratford. This was recorded in a tract called a *History of the Stage* which Malone thought was by William Chetwood, in about 1730. Malone is the only one to have noted this manuscript and the quote, and he thought the whole thing to be full of forgeries and misleading statements.[7]

The problem with (3) is that there is no other witness to Barnes than Chetwood, and if Malone believes he is a notorious forger then we can not rule out the possibility that he has fabricated this story based on Rowe. It seems quite possible, however, that Davies, (1), and Rowe, (2), obtained their information independently of one another. Overlap in their social circles has not come to attention.

[1] Facsimile of the notes by Davies are in SS DL, p.79. EKC F&P2, p.256. [2] EKC F&P2, p.257. This is only a brief summary of the early documentation of the legend, and does not summarise the copious wider discussion. SS CDL, pp.97–108 is a good summary of the other issues involved in determining the veracity of the tradition. Schoenbaum himself is skeptical, and on SS CDL, p.108 he suggests an event connected with the third Sir Thomas Lucy in 1610 as being the origin of the tradition that then, in this model, erroneously became attached to the early actions of Shakespeare. [3] SS CDL, p.98. [4] SS CDL, p.97. [5] EKC F&P2, p.281. [6] SS CDL, p.101–2. [7] HP O2, p.382.

c.1590 — *The Taming of the Shrew* is written.

§ Ann Thompson notes what she calls verbal parallels between *The Taming of the Shrew* and a play written by mid 1592 called *A Knack to Know a Knave*.[1] She gives seven examples, but apparently found further unpublished ones since she says that she quotes only the "most notable". Marvin Spevak has pointed out that reliance on parallels for determining the relationship between plays is fraught with the

divergences of subjective opinion. This even manifests itself in terminology, and as Spevak says the perceived links between play passages are "called rather indiscriminately 'echoes', 'quotations', 'paraphrases', 'reminiscences', 'parallels', and the like".[2] Though Spevak is not entirely dismissive of the practice, the caution that he urges is well founded. The terms quotation, paraphrase, and reminiscence all denote the act of borrowing from one text to another, for example, and therefore frame the evidence in a prejudicial way which may lead to error if, for example, both sources borrow from a common work or make use of a commonplace idiom. Echo does not as strongly denote this, but does at least connote it, and therefore incurs the same problem. The only term which Spevak lists which is free of prejudicial assumption is parallel. Of course it is reasonable to use the other terms if the nature of the parallel has already been established or is in consideration.

Thompson continues that it seems "virtually certain that the author of *A Knack* is borrowing from Shakespeare rather than the other way round since it would be most uncharacteristic of Shakespeare to borrow in this piecemeal way whereas *A Knack* is full of similar and very extensive borrowings".[3] *A Knack* even contains a parallel with Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, which was also probably written in or around 1590.[4] The perceived date of *Shrew* must be congruous to the validity of the parallels. If they are valid, then *Shrew* was written by early 1592. Because Shakespeare was busy with the *Henry VI* plays in 1591 and on into 1592, however, that would place *Shrew* further back, more likely to about 1590, and the same argument can be made for *Titus Andronicus*. This means that *Shrew* and *Titus* fit best at the point when Shakespeare probably started his career in London as a prominent individual playwright.[5]

[1] Thompson, Ann (1982). Dating Evidence for The Taming of the Shrew. Notes and Queries, 29.227. p.108. [2] Shakespeare, William (2004b). Julius Caesar. Spevak, Marvin (ed.), Cambridge. p.3. [3] Thompson, Ann (1982). Dating Evidence for The Taming of the Shrew. Notes and Queries, 29.227. p.109. [4] Steevens, in Malone, Edmond (1790). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Vol. 10, p.378. Cf. c.1590, the writing of *Titus Andronicus*. [5] Cf. Thomas, Sidney (1988). On the Dating of Shakespeare's Early Plays. Shakespeare Quarterly, 39.2. pp.187–94, and c.1590, Shakespeare starting his London career as an individual playwright.

§ Circumstantial dating evidence for *The Taming of the Shrew* is scant. An adaptation of the play was printed in 1594, and contains the stage direction "Enter Simon, Alphonsus,

and his three daughters",[1] but the only Simon in the play is not most logically a part of this scene.[2] In 1974 Mary Edmond found the will of Simon Jewell, an actor with Pembroke's Men from whose repertoire the printed text of the adaptation came,[3] and it was subsequently suggested that Simon Jewell may be the Simon referred to in the stage direction.[4] This is plausible since play texts often use the names of actors rather than characters, such as the direction for Will Kemp to enter in the First Folio text of *Romeo and Juliet*.[5] Jewell was buried on 21st August 1592,[6] so if he is the Simon in the stage direction then the play must not only be earlier than mid 1592—again reinforcing the indication of the *Knack* parallels—but since the text that Pembroke's Men used is an adaptation, there must have been time to adapt it too. The adaptation also quotes heavily from Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, but sadly Marlowe's play has proven very difficult to date.[7]

[1] Anon [Shakespeare, William, et al.] (1594). The Taming of a Shrew. EEBO, STC 23667. f.7. [2] Shakespeare, William (2002d). The Taming of the Shrew. Morris, Brian (ed.), Arden. p.51. [3] Edmond, Mary (1974). Pembroke's Men. Review of English Studies, Vol. 25. pp.129–36. [4] Dusinberre, Juliet (1993). The Taming of the Shrew: Women, Acting, and Power. Studies in the Literary Imagination, Vol. 26. pp.67–84 seems to be the first to suggest this, but she also believes it more plausible that the character Lord Simon is intended. Marino, James M. (2009). The Anachronistic Shrews. Shakespeare Quarterly, 60.1. fn.52 contains a list of scholars who believe that the actor is intended, which appears to be the current consensus. [5] Shakespeare, William (1599). Romeo and Juliet. EEBO, STC 22323. f.78, TLN 2680. [6] Edmond, Mary (1974). Pembroke's Men. Review of English Studies, Vol. 25. pp.133 says "his will is dated 19 August and he was buried two days later". [7] Shakespeare, William (2002d). The Taming of the Shrew. Morris, Brian (ed.), Arden. p.51 suggests between May and August 1592. These are called quotes because the nature of the parallels is not under contention.

§ The 1594 text from the Pembroke's Men repertoire is known as *A Shrew* because of its use of "a" instead of "the" in its printed title.[1] Henslowe also calls the play *a* Shrew when he records a performance on 11th June 1594 which was probably by the Lord Chamberlain's Men, of which Shakespeare was recorded to be a member in at least early 1595.[2] This and stylistic grounds has led Stephen Roy Miller to suggest that *The Taming of a Shrew* is the original title of the play (the First Folio text is still referred to normatively as *The Shrew*),[3] and that this text must be a later modification of the play that Shakespeare originally wrote because plot elements such as the continued Sly saga that *A Shrew* uses, and which appear to be Shakespearean, are missing.[4] The date of the

revisions made to the play are unclear, but the existence of *A Shrew* shows that the play in an early state still strongly resembles the received text from the First Folio.[5] Since the First Folio text also refers to a play by John Fletcher written after 1618, two years after Shakespeare died, it must have continued to be revised by other hands too.[6] The reference in question, to Fletcher's *Women Pleased*, is however somewhat peculiar:

> *Sincklo* I thinke 'twas *Soto* that your honor meanes.[7]

The speech prefix "Sincklo" is taken to refer to an actor called John Sinkclo, and there are no certain references to this actor on the stage after about 1604.[8] Yet the name Soto specifically appears in the context of the reference to *Women Pleased*. The wide disparity in dates here has been thoroughly examined by James J. Marino, but his intent was mainly to explore and expose certain errors of bias in treating this disparity, and he is loath to suggest himself any scenarios that may account for it.[9] Despite his sense of caution in such matters being reasonable and prudent, it may be ventured anyway that *Sincklo* could have started off as a reference to a member of the troupe performing the play, and that by 1618 it was either a commonplace or forgotten that this was the case; that in other words his name had become lexicalised by familiarity.

[1] Anon [Shakespeare, William, et al.] (1594). The Taming of a Shrew. EEBO, STC 23667. Title Page. [2] Q.v. 11th June 1594, and 15th March 1595. [3] Shakespeare, William (1998d). The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto. Miller, Stephen Roy (ed.), Cambridge. p.2 for the suggestion of the original title, and Shakespeare, William (1982b). The Taming of the Shrew. Oliver, H. J. (ed.), Oxford. p.13 for the convention of the name of the play as it appears in the First Folio. [4] Shakespeare, William (2003i). The Taming of the Shrew. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Cambridge. pp.2–3. [5] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.25. [6] Marino, James M. (2009). The Anachronistic Shrews. Shakespeare Quarterly, 60.1. pp.25–46. [7] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Comedies. p.209. [8] EKC ES 2, p.339, via Marino, who notes that Gurr gives c.1606 as the extent of Sincklo's career on the stage. [9] Marino, James M. (2009). The Anachronistic Shrews. Shakespeare Quarterly, 60.1. pp.25–46.

§ Though there is no definite indication as to which might have been Shakespeare's first play out of *Shrew* and *Titus*, both apparently written around 1590, the fact that *Shrew*'s opening scenes are set in rural Warwickshire is often commented on in this

connection.[1] No other play seems so closely related to Shakespeare's provincial origins. One of the characters mentioned at the beginning of the play is Marian Hacket, the "fat ale-wife of Wincot", which refers to the hamlet of Wincot five miles southwest of Stratford. As Schoenbaum observes, history is silent on whether Shakespeare encountered such a figure there; but he notes that people of the surname Hacket did live in the parish.[2]

[1] Shakespeare, William (2002d). The Taming of the Shrew. Morris, Brian (ed.), Arden. pp.62–3, for example. [2] SS CDL, pp.95–6.

§ *The Taming of the Shrew* is a controversial play because of the harsh treatment meted out to Katharina, the shrew, at the hands of Petruchio. Though there are readings of the play which can mitigate some of the audience surprise, the general critical reaction is one of negativity and confusion.[1] There have been arguments that this negative reaction is not an anachronistic modern response to the play, but that it would have been just as shocking in the Elizabethan period.[2] Since *The Taming of the Shrew* may be the earliest known play, and also therefore the first comedy, by Shakespeare, the question of Shakespeare's intentions in writing it have an extra importance.

The textual history of the play can be roughly characterised as having a first state of development, *Original Shrew*, which was then adapted for performance by Pembroke's Men and printed in 1594 as *A Shrew*. The *Original Shrew* was then edited by Shakespeare probably towards the end of the 1590s, and this is the version which appeared in the First Folio as *The Shrew*. This means that the *Original Shrew* is lost, apart from echoes of it that appear in *A Shrew*, which is however a very difficult patchwork text, heavily revised and containing peculiar characteristics.[3] So to be able to discern Shakespeare's intentions in *Original Shrew*, and gain a better perspective on his early creative output, we can only look through the fractured lens of *A Shrew* in comparison to the received *The Shrew*.

One recent excuse for the disagreeable elements of the play which is based on the fractured lens of *A Shrew* was developed by Peter Alexander in 1969. He argued that the ending of *A Shrew*, which does not appear at all in *The Shrew*, was an echo of Shakespeare's original.[4] The importance of this is in the way that the play is framed.

Christopher Sly is seen in both received texts to be duped into thinking that he is a lord, and watches a performance of a play, which is where the taming of the shrew, Katharina, takes place. Therefore there is a mitigation here, that the play is set in the imagination of a drunkard. The difference comes in the epilogue, which is only found in *A Shrew*: Sly wakes up in a drunken stupor and talks about the great play that he has dreamed of, and is scared that he will come in for a beating from his wife when he gets home. But he says that the dream play has taught him how to tame a shrew, and he will use this knowledge if need be. The tapster manages to convince Sly, however, to relate his story to him as he accompanies Sly home.

Alexander does not supply any internal evidence that this epilogue was written by Shakespeare, but there is in fact one indication that the epilogue of *A Shrew* echoes material from *Original Shrew*. The evidence is from earlier on in *A Shrew*, from the first words of the real lord as he enters into Sly's presence in the introduction:[5]

Now that the gloomie shaddow of the night,
Longing to view Orions drisling lookes,
Leapes from th'antarticke World vnto the skie
And dims the Welkin with her pitchie breath,
And darkesome night oreshades the christall heauens, [Line 5]
Here breake we off our hunting for to night,
Cupple vppe the hounds and let vs hie vs home,
And bid the huntsman see them meated well,
For they haue all deseru'd it well to daie,
But soft, what sleepie fellow is this lies heere? [Line 10]
Or is he dead, see one what he dooth lacke?

Lines 1–4 are taken from *Doctor Faustus* by Marlowe. There are over a dozen borrowings from Marlowe by the adaptor of *A Shrew*.[6] Line 5, on the other hand, is of the same lyric quality and yet not from Marlowe, and nor does it appear in *The Shrew*. One commentator even mistook it as part of the original material from Marlowe, and quoted it as such.[7] Lines 6–11 are on the other hand a clear pastiche of Shakespeare's lines in *The Shrew* as spoken by the lord, "Huntsman I charge thee, tender wel my

hounds" and so on. The question then becomes one of where this peculiar line, "And darkesome night oreshades the christall heauens", comes from: was it by Marlowe, by Shakespeare, or by the adaptor? There may be a clue in the epilogue of *A Shrew*:

Now that the darkesome night is ouerpast,
And dawning day apeares in cristall sky,
Now must I hast abroad: but soft whose this?

These lines are spoken, peculiarly given their style, by the tapster; they are very similar to the words spoken by the lord in the introduction. This probably means that the adaptor had transferred some of the material to another part of the play. This is not the only place where he does so: elsewhere he uses Shakespeare's comparison of roses washed with dew, but forgets the roses and paints the morning instead with dew, all in a different context to *The Shrew*.[8] If transference accounts for the present case it, it is important to resolve which line is the original. It would make more sense for the lord to be speaking in such lyric tones than a tapster, but this does not necessarily mean that the lord was speaking in such terms in the introduction. The epilogue in *A Shrew* says in a style appropriate to the lord that the night has passed, which raises the possibility that Shakespeare's epilogue originally contained the lord going home after the entertainments, followed by the tapster discovering Sly waking up. If this is the correct scenario, then the adaptor of the play may have taken the "darkesome night is ouerpast" line or its original and transferred it to the start of the play as "darkesome night oreshades the crystall heauens", a suggestion consistent with his other transferences.

Indeed it makes much more sense for the darksome night being overpast at the end of Sly's dream, after he has slept for a while, than at the beginning when presumably it was evening. Shakespeare's epilogue in its earlier state had therefore probably contained the lord going home after the entertainments and then the tapster discovering Sly waking up. The adaptor grafted these lines into the interpolation from Marlowe in the introduction making the whole thing more nonsensical.

What does this mean for the setting of the play? In the epilogue of *A Shrew*, the tapster tells Sly to go home because his wife will be scalding him for having stayed the night there drunk. Sly responds that he now knows how to tame a shrew. But perhaps this was meant to be played with some irony and trepidation from Sly, as though he does not believe his newfound confidence. This is suggested by the tapster's response: "Ile go home with thee", as though he wants to hear Sly's story on the journey, but also probably wants to make sure Sly gets home safely, and perhaps even diffuse the situation between Sly and his wife. This provides a diffuse and open end to the play; this reading is not necessarily the correct one. Moreover, the fact that the Lord was perhaps originally present in the epilogue but does not appear in the version in *A Shrew* makes it difficult to trust this version's narrative arrangement. But through the layers of possibility there is at least a strong reason to believe that there was a bookended context for lessening the overall impact of the play, reifying the misogynistic content into a finishing joke for the audience to take away.

Several questions still remain. Why, for example, was the Sly ending lost when the First Folio version of *The Shrew* was printed? And was the Sly context added to the central play after Shakespeare found the reaction to it to be harsh, or was it the intention all along to have such a frame? The references to Burtonheath (Barton-on-the-Heath?, where Shakespeare's aunt and uncle Joan and Edmund Lambert lived)[9] and Wincot, as well as the reference to the thirdborough, the constables of Warwickshire, potentially indicate that the Sly episode was written with Warwickshire somehow in mind. Perhaps it was even performed in Warwickshire. If any of this is the case, then the meaning of the Sly setting may be lost in provincial mists. Sly begins by seeing the play for real, and then wakes up believing that he has seen the play only in his dream, which leads the audience to wonder how much of the play was indeed reality, and how much was a dream. The segue of the play from plausible beginning to a growing outlandish behaviour from Petruchio may mirror the segue from the reality of the Lord's performance for Sly to Sly's own drunken stupor. The audience could then see the whole play as a dream that they have been pulled into witnessing, one which they did not realise to be a dream until Sly himself reported on it, just as Sly does not during the course of his dream realise that it started out in

reality. The growing madness of the play would be revealed only at the end to be due to a drunken dream. This is in a way typical of Shakespearean style.

[1] Hibbard, G. R. (ed.) (1995). Four Comedies. p.40 says that "Calling a shrew a shrew, and the play misogynist, characterizes most feminist criticism of the play", and gives a survey of some of this criticism. There are other points of view, of course: Kahn, Coppélia (1981). Man's Estate. p.104 argues that "Unlike other misogynistic shrew literature, this play satirizes not woman herself in the person of the shrew, but the male urge to control woman." The play could be argued as more subtle than either of these extremes, but a full discussion would extend beyond the remit of the present work. [2] Alexander, Peter (1969). The Original Ending of The Taming of the Shrew. Shakespeare Quarterly, 20.2. p.111. [3] Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.27 calls it a rewrite "cobbled up from a rough plot outline and a few fragmentary reminiscences of the original dialogue", which goes too far. Stephen Roy Miller's treatment of it is the best at present, and in Shakespeare, William (1998d). The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto. Miller, Stephen Roy (ed.), Cambridge. p.10 he characterises the adaptor as a "play doctor" who tries to glamourise the original. [4] Alexander, Peter (1969). The Original Ending of The Taming of the Shrew. Shakespeare Quarterly, 20.2. p.111, who argues that the original ending is "very imperfectly reported" in *A Shrew*. [5] Anon [Shakespeare, William, et al.] (1594). The Taming of a Shrew. EEBO, STC 23667. pp.2–3. [6] Gaines, Barry and Maurer, Margaret (2010). Three Shrew Plays. p.3. [7] Gray, Henry David (1941b). The Taming of A Shrew. In: Maxwell, Baldwin, et al. (eds.). Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig. p.138. The misquoter was Smart, noticed here by Gray in his excellent piece. [8] Gray, Henry David (1941b). The Taming of A Shrew. In: Maxwell, Baldwin, et al. (eds.). Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig. pp.134–5. [9] Honan, p.135.

c.1590 — *Titus Andronicus* is written, by George Peele and Shakespeare.

[*] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.155 note that scene 3.2 was probably added after the earliest performances. Ioppolo, Grace (1991). Revising Shakespeare. p.107 dates the addition to the 1590s, but notes that it may have even been added after 1611. The small addition does not affect the date for the majority of the play.

§ Steevens was the first to note that *A Knack to Know a Knave*, a play of unknown authorship from the early 1590s, contains the following parallel to *Titus Andronicus*, which Chambers argues is a specific allusion to the latter:[1]

Osrick. My gratious Lord, as welcome shall you be,
To me, my Daughter, and my sonne in Law,

As *Titus* was vnto the Roman Senators,
When he had made a conquest on the Goths[2]

The reference of Titus and the Goths must be to Peele and Shakespeare's play because, as Chambers points out, no other story has been found to contain such an association.[3] If such a story did exist but has been lost, it is an anomaly amongst Shakespearean major plot sources, with the possible exception of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Various scholars have shown that a contemporary ballad and a later narrative, which might otherwise have provided source material, were based on the play rather than the other way around.[4]

This text of *Knack* is from the version of the play entered in the Stationers' Register on 7th January 1594,[5] but the play itself is much earlier: Henslowe records a performance in his diary as early as 10th June 1592, and marks it as "ne".[6] The use of "ne" in Henslowe's diary is not entirely clear, but R. A. Foakes notes that quite possibly it "refers to the licensing of a playbook for performance by the Master of the Revels."[7] This would account for the high takings of all the plays marked as "ne", because a license was required only when a play was new or when it had been substantially revised, when there would be a special draw for people to view the performance. The latter scenario, that of revision, was probably in this case the reason behind Henslowe marking *Titus Andronicus* as "ne" on 23rd January 1594 (q.v.).

There is no evidence to suggest whether the 10th June 1592 performance of *A Knack to Know a Knave* was its first or a revision, but it shows that the play was definitely written in the first half of 1592 at the latest. This pushes the latest date of the composition of *Titus Andronicus* to roughly the end of 1591. The ascription of *Titus Andronicus* to 1590 is mainly on the basis that the Henry VI plays 1 and 2 *Contention* were written as a continuous sequence which pushes into 1592, meaning that 1591 was most reasonably occupied with their writing.

[1] Malone, Edmond (1790). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Vol. 10, p.378, EKC F&P1, p.319. [2] Anon (1594). A Knack to Know a Knave. EEBO, STC 15027, Image 23. [3] EKC F&P1, p.319. [4] Summarised by Shakespeare, William (2003j). Titus Andronicus. Bate, Jonathan (ed.), Arden. p.83, citing Mincoff, Hunter, and Jackson. [5] Anon (1963). A Knack to Know a Knave. Proudfoot, G. R.

(ed.). p.v. Stationers' Register entry in Arber 2, p.304 / 643. [6] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.19. [7] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.xxxiv–xxxv.

§ There has long been a tradition that *Titus Andronicus* was not written by Shakespeare alone. The first such rumour comes from the restoration period playwright Edward Ravenscroft, who published an adaptation of *Titus Andronicus* in 1687 which was prefaced by a piece whose main intent seems to have been to defray in advance any accusations of plagiarism:

"I have been told by some anciently conversant with the Stage, that it was not Originally his, but brought by a private Author to be Acted, and he only gave some Master-touches to one or two of the Principal Parts or Characters; this I am apt to believe, because 'tis the most incorrect and indigested piece in all his Works; It seems rather a heap of Rubbish than a Structure."[1]

This story about the play's origins specifically links the quality of the play to the idea that Shaksepeare can not be responsible for it. It became increasingly uncomfortable to critics in the centuries to come, as moral values became increasingly sensitive, to believe that such a violent and gory piece could be by Shakespeare. As Alan Hughes puts it, "*Titus Andronicus* simply offended their literary taste, and they wished to absolve Shakespeare of the responsibility for perpetrating it."[2]

At the beginning of the 20th century, then, there was a cultural bias against crediting Shakespeare with the authorship of *Titus Andronicus*, but no good cases had been evinced for the identities of any alternative authors. This changed in 1905, when J. M. Robertson proposed George Peele as the principal author.[3] Robertson's reputation was torn to pieces by Chambers a few decades later,[4] but the suggestion of Peele's hand in a smaller extent through the play continued to grow in acceptability throughout the 20th century as the matter was looked into with greater care. In the 21st century John Jowett was to say, of a series of studies recent to his writing in 2003, that if one "had to choose in the light of these new contributions between identifying *Titus* as by Shakespeare or by Shakespeare and Peele, the latter would be the safer bet."[5] Indeed the case may be even stronger than Jowett indicates: Tom Rooney presented a spirited

essay in 2008 which exposes some biases that now work against accepting Peele's co-authorship.[6] Scholars may therefore have an opposite bias one century on from the turn of the 20th century, making them believe incorrectly that Peele had less of a share than he really did. Rooney cites especially the interesting case of Jonathan Bate, the Arden Shakespeare series editor who recently changed his opinion from doubting Peele's involvement to accepting it.

The evidence for Peele's involvement, then, has continued to mount, but depends on technical arguments that have been conducted against a background of competing cultural biases. There is one recent argument that may, however, help to illuminate the problem from a broader perspective. Alan Hughes has been very skeptical of stylometric evidence, and agrees with those who do not accept Peele's involvement:

"While methods are questionable and results inconclusive, many good scholars intuitively feel that much of the verse is too clichéd and monotonous to be Shakespeare's, particularly in Act 1. These doubts tend to evaporate, however, when we recall that he was a dramatist and a theatrical craftsman as well as a poet. Indeed, it is conceivable that his theatrical talents matured first. Perhaps when he first drafted *Titus Andronicus*, at the beginning of his career, Peele's literary influence stifled his embryonic style."[7]

It is an obvious flaw in this argument that provides the insight. Though it makes sense to suppose that Shakespeare may have been feeling his way into writing for the stage with *Titus Andronicus*, there has been no convincing scenario proposed to account for the fact that Peele should have had such a huge "literary influence", as Hughes puts it, on Shakespeare. Why should Shakespeare not have looked to Kyd and Marlowe during this period? And why should Peele's tremendous influence be limited to this one play, and indeed only certain scenes in this one play? It is unlikely that Peele would have such a concentrated influence, an influence which would indeed have to be supposed both stifling in its intensity, and yet, in complete contradiction, limited to a few scenes in a single play. On balance it is safe to assume that Peele wrote the sections that are becoming ever more reliably attributed to him.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1687). Titus Andronicus. Ravenscroft, Edward (ed.). EEBO, Wing S2949. To the Reader, Huntington Library copy. [2] Shakespeare, William (2006c). Titus Andronicus. Hughes, Alan (ed.), Cambridge. p.10. [3] Robertson, J. M. (1905). Did Shakespeare Write "Titus Andronicus"? p.238. He also argues that if written by Shakepseare, it cannot have been so before 1594. [4] Shakespeare, William (2006c). Titus Andronicus. Hughes, Alan (ed.), Cambridge. p.11. [5] Jowett, John (2003b). The Year's Contributions to Shakespeare Studies: Editions and Textual Studies. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 50. p.288. [6] Rooney, Tom (2008). (Re)Presenting Shakespeare's Co-Authors: Lessons from the Oxford Shakespeare. In: Bradshaw, Graham and Bishop, Tom (eds.). The Shakespearean International Yearbook, Vol. 8. pp.226–9. [7] Shakespeare, William (2006c). Titus Andronicus. Hughes, Alan (ed.), Cambridge. p.11.

c.1590 — Shakespeare writes *Edward III*, probably in collaboration with at least one other author, possibly Thomas Kyd.

§ On the date of *Edward III*, Braunmuller gives the following summaries of the opinions of three scholars: "the period 1589–1592" by Lapides, "about 1590" and "not later than 1592" by MacDonald P. Jackson, and "about 1589–90" by Wentersdorf.[1] One of the primary bases for these estimates, giving an earliest possible date for the play, is the reference in the play made to the Spanish Armada of 1588. In terms of the relationship of the work to the rest of the Shakespearean canon, Shakespeare seems to have been busy at work on his *1 Contention* (2 Henry IV), *2 Contention* (3 Henry IV), and *Richard III* plays in 1591 to 1592, and the only other plays which I date to precede those are the *Taming of the Shrew*, a comedy, and *Titus Andronicus*, a tragedy. It is perhaps notable, then, that *Edward III* is an early history by Shakespeare. Perhaps it was his first foray into history writing, and his experiences with it provided the motivation to write his plays dealing with the Wars of the Roses, the contention between the houses of Lancaster and York? If so, then it may be that *Edward III* came after *Shrew* and *Titus*, both of which were written around 1590, but before the contention plays, both written around 1591. On that basis a 1590 date for *Edward III* is the most likely. The earlier year is preferred for two reasons. First, that *Shrew* was written earlier than the estimate of 1590 is more likely the contention plays being written later than their estimate of 1591. Second, *Titus Andronicus* is, like *Edward III*, likely to be a collaboration and therefore would require less effort than a play written entirely by Shakespeare. 1590 is also the only year in the intersection of all of the dates suggested by Lapides, MacDonald P. Jackson, and Wentersdorf.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2008g). King John. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.13.

§ The stylometric arguments for the attribution of *Edward III* can be summarised as follows. In work produced in 1981, Eliot Slater argued that Shakespeare wrote the entire play in two phases, revising scenes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, and 4.4 after original composition, though he found these scenes to have weaker links to Shakespearean style.[1] In 1982, Harold Metz attributed to Shakespeare the scenes that Slater considered revised, but thought that it was questionable whether Shakespeare had written the whole play.[2] Metz believed 4.4 to have the strongest strongest claim of attribution to Shakespeare. Jonathan Hope studied the problem in 1994, but he compared the play with the works of no authors who were known to be writing at the time that *Edward III* was published and before.[3] Brian Vickers in 2008 and 2009 also stated belief that Slater's "revised" scenes at least were by Shakespeare, drawing on work by Timothy Irish Watt.[4]

Though Slater's "revised" scenes are considered by his tests to have weaker links to Shakespearean style than the rest of the play, later commentators disagree. The consensus amongst these speculations is that Shakespeare was involved in creating the play, and that this involvement is clearest in scenes 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, and perhaps especially 4.4. If Shakespeare collaborated to create the play, it is not clear who else was involved. Slater rules out Marlowe, but does not discount Kyd. The case for Kyd may have some bearing on the characterisation of the poetic ruffian Shakebag in Kyd's *Arden of Feversham*. Warren Stevenson also believes that additions, first published in 1602, to *The Spanish Tragedy* by Kyd may have been by Shakespeare, giving further indication of possible collaboration between the two.[5]

[1] Slater, Eliot (1988). The Problem of the Reign of King Edward III. pp.132–5. [2] Metz, George Harold (1989). Sources of Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare. p.20. [3] Hope, Jonathan (1994). The Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays. He chooses Fletcher, Marlowe, Dekker, Middleton, and Massinger. Fletcher is not known to have written plays prior to 1606; Dekker is not known to have written substantial parts of plays before the late 1590s, though this does not preclude earlier collaboration; no works of Middleton were published before 1603; and in 1596, when *Edward III* was printed, Philip Massinger was only twelve years old. [4] Vickers, Brian (2011). Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century. Shakespeare Quarterly, 62.1. p.141. [5] Stevenson, Warren (2008). Shakespeare's Additions to Thomas Kyd's "The Spanish Tragedy": A Fresh Look at the Evidence Regarding the 1602 Additions.

6th March 1590 — A "Thomas Green alias Shakspere", who may have been related to both Shakespeare and his later lodger Thomas Greene, is buried in Stratford.

* EKC F&P2, p.149, Schoenbaum, S. (1991). Shakespeare's Lives. p.228.

1591

1591 — The *Troublesome Raigne of John King of England*, by George Peele, is published.

* Anon (1591). Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England. EEBO, STC 14644, part one. Cf. c.1596, entry on *King John*, for relevance.

c.1591 — *1 Contention* is written.

* Q.v. c.1591 the writing of *2 Contention* for a justification of the date, especially that 1591 is more likely than 1590. Cf. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.55, who believe that the play "probably belongs to 1590–1".

§ The Shakespearean plays on the Wars of the Roses and the reigns of kings Henry VI and Edward IV have been conventionally titled "1 Henry VI", "2 Henry VI", and "3 Henry VI" since the publication of the First Folio in 1623. The parts were numbered according to the chronology of events within the plays themselves, not according to the order in which they were written. There is strong evidence that parts two and three were written first as a duad which would in modern terms be known as *The Whole Contention*. The evidence for this is worth reviewing, as such a review leads to the conclusion that modern scholarly characterisation of the three plays is hindered by the nomenclature probably introduced in the First Folio.

Because of this evidence, what are commonly known as Parts 1, 2, and 3 of the Henry VI plays will be referred to by the names *1st Henry VI*, *1 Contention*, and *2 Contention* throughout respectively. *1 Henry VI* was written last as a prequel to the other two parts; the use of "1st" instead of "1" in the title of *1st Henry VI* therefore emphasises its nature as a prequel rather than a first written part. It also reflects the fact that the designation is not, and indeed is to be distinguished from, a regular part number since *1st Henry VI* is not a part of *The Whole Contention*, and that the designation is to be viewed as a workaround for what should really be called simply "Henry VI" if it were not for the fact that this would cause confusion.

§ Versions of 1 *Contention* and 2 *Contention* were printed in a quarto and an octavo respectively in 1594,[1] the first of any plays by Shakespeare to be printed, though without the author's name. The exact status of these texts in relation to the versions in the First Folio is strongly debated, and may be impossible to determine,[2] but they are substantially the same plays and show equal signs of reportage and revision, so that the quarto and octavo may be reported texts of earlier versions of the plays in the First Folio.[3] The titles of these two editions were:[4]

(1) The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good Duke Humphrey: / And the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolke, and the Tragicall end of the proud Cardinal of Winchester, with the notable Rebellion of Jack Cade: / And the Duke of Yorkes first claim unto the Crowne [1594, Quarto]
(2) The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt, / with the Whole Contention betweene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke [1595, Octavo]

Scholars give these texts modern short titles such as *The Contention* and *True Tragedy* respectively,[5] but this choice of nomenclature is poor. There are two reasons why. The first is that the title of the octavo is introduced as "The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke", which identifies the type of play and one of the characters. In the First Folio, *Hamlet* is "The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke", but that play is not known as *The Tragedy*, but rather *Hamlet*. Similarly, "The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke" ought to be known as *Richard Duke of York* on this logic, and indeed for example Dobson and Wells use this name for the octavo.[6] But the second reason suggests an altogether different modern short title for the octavo. Both of the 1594–5 works contain a summary of the contents of the play, and the title of the play itself. The quarto talks about the deaths of Gloucester, Suffolk, and the Cardinal, Cade's rebellion, and York's claim. The octavo talks about York's death, and Henry's death. The detail apparently not yet pointed out elsewhere is that the quarto simply puts the descriptions last, whereas the octavo puts them first. The remainders of the titles without the content descriptions are "The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster" (Quarto), and "the Whole Contention

betweene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke" (Octavo). These are essentially the same titles, aside from the part designation. In fact, on the title page of the Octavo, there is a blank line above "the Whole Contention" which is then printed in larger font, giving it focus. The argument is clear: the play is referred to in both cases with a title regarding the contention between the houses of Lancaster and York.

This argument is reinforced by three further points. The first is the observation that for the quarto to be printed as the first part of the contention &c., then there must be a second part. That part is of course the octavo. Though the octavo is not called the second part on the title page, it is reasonable to infer then that these were regarded as the first and second part in a two part series under the same umbrella title. The second point is that to sell as many copies of a play as possible, it is best to sell it under the title by which is was normally known. If this is so in the case of the quarto and octavo, then this provides an argument for believing that the contention title which is derivable from the title pages is the same as that which Shakespeare gave the plays. The third point regards the publication of the quarto and octavo again in 1619 by William Jaggard, in a work described by some scholars as the *false folio*,[7] under a single copy. Both parts of the contention were printed in a single work with the following single title page text:[8]

(3) The Whole Contention betweene the two Famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke / With the Tragicall ends of the good Duke Humfrey, Richard Duke of Yorke, and King Henrie the sixt [1619]

Note again how a summary description of the events of the play accompanies the general title. The title page also refers to the work as "Divided into two Parts: And newly corrected and enlarged." If the titles of each of the three play texts are compared without the summary descriptions, it is possible to see where they agree best:

(1) the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster
(2) the Whole Contention betweene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke
(3) The Whole Contention betweene the two Famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke

The title of the 1619 text agrees in places with each of the 1594–5 texts where they do not agree against one another, which indicates that it is not dependant on any one specific antecedent. Taking the agreements together, then, it would seem that the most likely original title for the play as a two part series was *The Whole Contention Between the Two Famous Houses Lancaster and York*, which may be shortened to *The Whole Contention*. Instead of "2 Henry VI" and "3 Henry VI", the more suitable short designations are *1 Contention* and *2 Contention*. This original title explains why Philip Henslowe called what was likely *1st Henry VI* simply "harey the vj" in his diary,[9] when he was careful to give a part number to any play which was part of a larger sequence. He may simply not have considered *1st Henry VI* a part of the sequence at all, unlike the editors of the First Folio. Indeed there is no evidence at all that the plays were known by the 1, 2, and 3 Henry VI designations until the First Folio, which is where these titles likely debuted, even after Shakespeare's death when Jaggard printed the false folio in 1619.

[1] Ribner, Irving (2005). The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. p.92. [2] Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. pp.121–2 gives a good summary of the theories. [3] Adduced by Shakespeare, William (2001c). Henry VI, Part Three. Martin, Randall (ed.), Oxford. p.105 with regards to *2 Contention*. [4] Anon [Shakespeare, William] (1594). The First Part of the Contention. EEBO, STC 26099, and Anon [Shakespeare, William] (1595). The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York. EEBO, STC 21006. [5] For example Cerasano, Susan P. (2005). Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England. Vol. 18. p.42, Shakespeare, William (1998d). The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto. Miller, Stephen Roy (ed.), Cambridge. p.37, in addition to Ribner, Irving (2005). The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. p.92, Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.121. [6] Dobson, Michael and Wells, Stanley W. (2001). The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare. p.140. [7] E.g. Solomon, Deborah Cosier (2010). The Seventeenth-Century Timeline. In: Evans, Robert C. and Sterling, Eric J. (eds). The Seventeenth-Century Literature Handbook. p.30, and Sampson, George and Church, Reginald C. (1972). The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature. p.233. [8] Anon [Shakespeare, William] (1619). The Whole Contention. EEBO, STC 26101, advertised falsely as printed 1600. [9] Cf. 3rd March 1592.

§ The original title *The Whole Contention* for what are conventionally called *2 Henry VI* and *3 Henry VI* is probably authorial. But, independently of this point, it is worth debating whether they should be known now by their original titles. On the one hand accuracy is desirable, but on the other, as an example, *Henry VIII* was originally known as *All is True*, and though some editions such as the Oxford Shakespeare have sought to retain

that play's original title,[1] there is general acceptance that the title *Henry VIII* is still suitable and mainstream.

The case can be shown, however, to be very different for *The Whole Contention*, despite existing argument that the case is the same. In the Arden edition of *1 Contention* (called *2 Henry VI* there), for example, Hattaway admits the contention title as authorial, but says that there is "equally no reason to disturb tradition and rename it for modern audiences."[2] He gives no reason why this is so, and perhaps he considers it self explanatory. But a tradition may be broken if the case for breaking it is stronger than that of keeping it. His use of the word "disturb" is out of place here, as a tradition cannot be "disturbed" any more than an ineffectual drug could be disturbed if a more effectual one were developed, or a manufacturing process if it were superseded. Things worth changing ought to be changed.

There are, broadly, two perspectives from which the change may be considered. The first is the popular general perspective, and the second is the scholarly academic perspective. The audience going to see one of the plays titled regarding Henry VI for the first time may be surprised by the comparative lack of focus on him.[3] These plays are about the Wars of the Roses, and the primary figures are Margaret, Warwick, and York and his sons. Henry himself cuts an ineffectual background figure, as an ineffectual king who wafts about like the feather that he himself uses to demonstrate the whim of the common people. Though Henry is the cause of the Wars, he is not part of their most vivid drama. The most vivid drama indeed emerges primarily from his inability to make good policy. So even in the popular general perspective, the change of name may be appropriate.

There is an even stronger argument from the scholarly academic perspective. This argument is that the use of the title *The Whole Contention* for 2H6 and 3H6 best characterises the strong relationship between them, as a two part play; a duad separate in the development of Shakespeare's career from 1H6. When they were written, they were written as a first and a second part, and the end of the first part is written as a cliff hanger to make audiences want to see the second, a kind of early modern marketing ploy. The cliff hanger at the end of *2 Contention* (3H6) is the development of

the character of the Duke of Gloucester, who would become Richard III, about which Shakespeare then wrote a further play, *Richard III*, where the focus moves away from the contention between the two houses.

On the other hand, there was also the prequel, *1st Henry VI*. This is an unusual play because it was written as a collaboration between several playwrights, one of whom was Thomas Nashe, the others unidentified apart from Shakespeare,[4] who contributed less than 20% of the whole play.[5] Contrast with this *Richard III*, which is one of the longest of the Shakespearean canon.[6] The company who played both parts of *The Whole Contention* did not perhaps even play *1st Henry VI*, since Henslowe records only the latter in his diary, if the identification to that play is correct, and neither of the parts of the former. So which did Shakespeare more have his mind towards? This small collaboration for another company should be thought of as a side project, one which pales in comparison with both *The Whole Contention* and *Richard III*. This is to say nothing of the calibre and quality of *1st Henry VI*, but merely how it stands in relation to the personal creative development of Shakespeare, and his textual canon as a whole. Characterising the three works as 1, 2, and 3 Henry VI gives a primacy to *1st Henry VI* that it does not have in terms of creative development, and needlessly and even carelessly evaporates the tight artistic binding between the two parts of *The Whole Contention*. Though the old terminology made sense in the First Folio, as a display cabinet of works, it does not make sense in a modern academic environment in which scholars grapple to make sense of the artistic development of already so complex an author.

[1] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1247. [2] Shakespeare, William (1991). The Second Part of King Henry VI. Hattaway, Michael (ed.), Cambridge. p.66. [3] The case of *Julius Caesar* amongst the Shakespearean canon is also noticeable, with the play's focus on Brutus. [4] Taylor, Gary (1995). Shakespeare and Others. Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England, by Leeds Barroll (ed). p.164. [5] Based on calculations using simple statistical analyses}. [6] EKC F&P2, p.398 puts Richard III second for length after Hamlet.

c.1591 — 2 *Contention* is written.

* The textual history of 2 *Contention* is complicated by the three printings of a version of it prior to the First Folio version. The earlier versions were an octavo of 1595 (O), and quartos of 1600 (Q2), and 1619 (Q3). The relationship between these earlier versions and the later First Folio version is much debated. Shakespeare, William (2001c). Henry VI, Part Three. Martin, Randall (ed.), Oxford. p.105 argues that that the earlier versions constitute "a memorially reported early version of the play that Shakespeare substantially revised" as the received 2 *Contention*.

§ The original version of 2 *Contention* cannot have been written later than June 1592. The theatres were closed in this month, and were not reopened before the printing of the *Groatsworth of Wit* which famously parodies the tiger's heart line from this play.[1] Furthermore, Thomas Nashe alludes to *1st Henry VI* in *Pierce Penniless*, which was entered in the Stationers' Register on 8th August 1592,[2] earlier than the *Groatsworth of Wit*, which means that *1st Henry VI* must also have been written and performed before June 1592. If *1st Henry VI* was written as a prequel after 2 *Contention*, as seems least unlikely,[3] then there must have been time before June 1592 for the writing and successful staging of it for Nashe to boast about. This means that 2 *Contention* itself was probably written by the end of the first quarter of 1592 at latest, and since we do not know for how long *1st Henry VI* was on stage before the closures we can best assume a 1591 date for 2 *Contention*, and indeed therefore for 1 *Contention* as well.[4]

[1] Cf. 20th September 1592. [2] Arber 2, p.292 / 619. [3] Cf. 3rd March 1592. [4] As Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.91 notes, 2 *Contention* is "clearly a continuation of *The First Part of the Contention*." The date of 1 *Contention* depends on the date of 2 *Contention*, which in turn depends on the date of *1st Henry VI*.

c.1591 — Shakespeare may have written additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* by Kyd, subsequently published in a 1602 edition of that play.

* Stevenson, Warren (2008). Shakespeare's Additions to Thomas Kyd's "The Spanish Tragedy": A Fresh Look at the Evidence Regarding the 1602 Additions.

§ The attribution to Shakespeare by Stevenson is tentative. There are two resemblances in the additions to lines in other Shakespearean plays: "I pried me through the Crevice of a Wall" by Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* 5.1, and "And Things called whippes?" by the Duke of Gloucester in 1 *Contention*. Since these two plays date to around 1590 and 1591 respectively, if Shakespeare did write these additions then he most likely made

them in this period. Shakespeare may also have worked with Thomas Kyd on *Edward III*, though again this is speculative. One argument against a later date is that the Admiral's Men had revived *The Spanish Tragedy* in 1597.[1] Shakespeare is unlikely to have written an addition for them as he is not known to have written for any company but the Lord Chamberlain's Men, subsequently the King's Men, after joining them. The revival by the Admiral's Men also makes it less likely that the Lord Chamberlain's Men were staging the play in the same period just prior to the publication of the additions in 1602. Jonson was paid for additions to *The Spanish Tragedy* in September 1601 and June 1602,[2] but these additions were not those printed in 1602 as they had been parodied earlier by Marston in *Antonio and Mellida* of c.1599.[3] That Jonson made additions may at any rate explain why additions by Shakespeare in c.1591 suddenly came to print in 1602; that interest in additions to the play had been drummed up by Jonson.

[1] Edwards, Philip (1959). The Spanish Tragedy. p.lxvi. [2] Kyd, Thomas (2009). The Spanish Tragedy. Gurr, Andrew and Mulryne, J. R. (eds.). Introduction (Gurr), p.xix. [3] Marston, John (2005). Antonio and Mellida. Gair, W. Reavley (ed.). pp.21–22. The notice of the parody, and the sum paid to Jonson, is from Gurr.

24th February 1591 — Adrian Quiney, Humfrey Plum, and Richard Hill pursue John Shakespeare for debt.

[*] HP O2, p.244.

1592

c.1592 — *1st Henry VI* is written, by Thomas Nashe, Shakespeare, and others.

* See 3rd March 1592 for an argument that this date reflects the first performance of this play. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.125 also make this assessment, saying that *1st Henry VI* is "probably the 'new' play referred to as 'harey the vj' in the record of its performance on 3 March 1592 by Lord Strange's Men".

§ *1st Henry VI* is extremely perplexing in respect of both date and authorship. The main issue with regard to the date is whether the play was written before *1 Contention* or after *2 Contention*. The consensus at the start of the 21st century is that it was written after *2 Contention*, and that it was a collaboration.[1] If this is so, then we are faced with what Michael Taylor very rightly describes as an odd situation:

"And so we have the odd situation where we have to imagine that Part Two and Part Three were plays written by Shakespeare alone (hence their superiority over Part One) and then, presumably, after having scored a theatrical success with them (why else write a 'prequel'?) Shakespeare, for some reason, decides to collaborate with others (hence the inferiority of *1st Henry VI*) to produce a play that acts as a prologue to the events described in *The Contention* and *Richard Duke of York*."[2]

Michael Taylor is especially impressed by Gary Taylor's suggestion that one of the primary collaborators with Shakespeare on *1st Henry VI* was the great satirist and playwright Thomas Nashe. Michael Taylor does however point out the peculiar incongruence of assigning to Nashe, often hailed as an outstanding writer, one of the most problematic parts of *1st Henry VI*. Interpretation of the quality of the opening act attributed to Nashe is, however, a matter of opinion; it may also be considered of excellent lyric quality, especially in the opening scene. Yet this does not explain why Nashe referred to the play as wildly successful,[3] but without taking explicit credit for it. On the positive side, Gary Taylor had suggested that Nashe wrote most of the first act.[4] There is a parallel for this structure later on: Nashe wrote the first act of *The Isle of Dogs*, which was finished by Ben Jonson and others, and called it an imperfect embryo

of a play. Perhaps *1st Henry VI* was an earlier first-act imperfect embryo of a play that was passed to others to finish? *The Isle of Dogs* was such a scandalous play (unfortunately no known copy of it has survived), however, that it landed Jonson in prison and saw Nashe fleeing to the safety of the provinces, so the similarities only continue to a point.

1st Henry VI is a peculiar play in the canon. It was the only play to be staged at The Rose by Henslowe, and it seems that Shakespeare only contributed a small part to the play. If Gary Taylor's allocation of authorship is accurate,[5] then Shakespeare contributed just over 500 lines to a 3000 line play, just one sixth of the play, about 17% by lines. For comparison, Shakespeare's contributions to *Sir Thomas More* come to about 7% of that play by lines, and the whole of that play is only about 500 lines shorter than *1st Henry VI*.[6] *Sir Thomas More* is not considered to be a play by Shakespeare, but is instead characterised as a collaboration in which Shakespeare had a small part. Yet *1st Henry VI* is considered a Shakespeare play, despite the fact that the size of his contribution is more comparable to *Sir Thomas More* than even his plays written as even divisions of labour, let alone the plays which he wrote solely by himself. The decision of whether or not to accept *1st Henry VI* into the canon should be made based on the proportion of the labour that Shakespeare contributed to it.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1952). The First Part of King Henry VI. Dover Wilson, John (ed.), Cambridge. pp.xii–xiii. [2] Shakespeare, William (2004a). Henry VI, Part One. Taylor, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.13. [3] Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.221 says that Nashe refers to "a vastly popular Talbot play seen by 'ten thousand spectators at least (at seuerall times)'". [4] Taylor, Gary (1995). Shakespeare and Others. Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England, by Leeds Barroll (ed). p.174. [5] Taylor, Gary (1995). Shakespeare and Others. Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England, by Leeds Barroll (ed). p.164. [6] Based on calculations using simple statistical analyses of plain text versions of the play found online.

c.1592 — *Richard III* is written.

§ *Richard III* is a difficult play to date, with no early performances known and no clear chronological references within the play. It does seem to be configured as a sequel to *2 Contention* which means that it was probably written after the c.1591 date for that play. It may have been the very next play that Shakespeare wrote, intending to

continue the series as a kind of trilogy. *Richard III* at least has a far stronger claim to being part of a real or hypothetical trilogy than does *1st Henry VI*, the latter being an unusual play in terms of the division in labour.[1]

Labour is also an important factor in placing *Richard III* in the sequence of Shakespeare's literary output. Shakespeare wrote an average of just over two plays per year between 1590 to 1599 inclusive. There are years where Shakespeare probably wrote three plays in the year, with 1599 being a notable example. Because *Richard III* is one of the most difficult of Shakespeare plays to date, the surrounding plays were dated first and then analysed to discover where it is most likely that *Richard III* would fit, based on this two to two-and-a-half works per year average. Using this metric, the only gap in the resulting chronology that is receptive to *Richard III* is the beginning of 1592, making the play a direct sequel to *1* and *2 Contention*. This would make 1592 an interesting year for Shakespeare: *Richard III*, at 3416 lines of dialogue in Q1,[2] is one of the longest Shakespearean plays. But the other two plays dated to this year, *1st Henry VI* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, come in terms of Shakespeare's contribution to about 2500 lines *combined*, which is less than the 2671 line length average for Shakespeare.[3] The closing of the playhouses on 23rd June 1592 may have effectively split the year in two for the playwrights. This may be reflected in Shakespeare's output being more profuse at the beginning of the year than the end. He may also have started *Richard III* some time towards the end of 1591, making more space for it in the chronology.[4]

[1] Taylor, Gary (1995). Shakespeare and Others. Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England, by Leeds Barroll (ed). p.164. [2] Maguire, Laurie E. (1996). Shakespearean Suspect Texts. p.215. [3] Gurr, Andrew (1999). Maximal and Minimal Texts: Shakespeare v. The Globe. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 52. p.84. The figure is originally from Alfred Hart. [4] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.183 on the other hand argue for around 1592 and discount any possibility of 1591, saying that Richard III was performed for the first time "probably in late 1592 or early 1593, outside London".

c.1592 — *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is written.

§ The earliest that *Verona* could have been written is 1590, because it uses material from John Lyly's *Midas*, which was first performed at the beginning of that year.[1] The latest that it could have been written is technically 1598, when Francis Meres

becomes the first to mention the play,[2] but critical opinion is strongly inclined towards treating this as one of Shakespeare's earliest works.[3] On this point, however, the position is not entirely clear. Dr. Johnson said that the play reveals a "strange mixture of knowledge and ignorance, of care and negligence",[4] and this mixture has been difficult to reconcile in terms of placing it within the Shakespearean canon. Do the knowledge and care point to a later date collectively showing more development, or do the ignorance and negligence point to an early date?

Lyly's *Midas* was published in 1592,[5] and though Shakespeare may of course have seen the play performed and may also have seen it in manuscript, perhaps this is a clue to a 1592 or post-1592 date. There are two further clues, admittedly tenuous, which appear to indicate a 1592 date. First, there is no 1590s edition of this play, unlike those with the name of Pembroke's Men on the title page which suggests they were in that company's repertory and may even have been sold by them: *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Titus Andronicus*, *1 Contention*, and *2 Contention*. Second, *Richard III* displays the same penchant for parallel rhetorical constructions which are prominent in *Verona*. If these three indications be admitted, it may also be relevant that Francis Meres knew about *Verona* but mentioned neither *The Taming of the Shrew* nor the Wars of the Roses plays, though he does mention *Titus*, which was being performed in 1596.[6] Moreover, the fact that the theatres closed in 1592, extending partly into 1593, may help to explain why the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* does not have any recorded performances and does not find any mention at all until Meres includes it in his famous list. The *Two Gentlemen of Verona* was probably not later revised by Shakespeare unlike *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Titus Andronicus*, which would make them appear more polished. It was also only his second attempt at comedy, and by now he was clearly more proficient in and accomplished at history; he would continue to show less proficiency in his comedy than his history writing with *Love's Labour's Lost* in 1593, which may have extended into or been rectified in the now lost *Love's Labour's Won*.

Verona is one of the most difficult to date of all the Shakespeare plays, but the dual factors of negligence and care do confine it to a very packed period, in which 1592 provides a slender but plausible gap. To argue 1590, one would have to explain the polish; to argue 1591, one would have to explain the workload against the two

contention plays and perhaps the start of *Richard III*. To argue 1593 one would have to explain why Shakespeare wrote sloppily and for closed theatres, but 1593 may be regarded as the second most plausible date after 1592. Perhaps the brevity and small cast repertoire—the play is performable by eight adults and three boys[7]—is explained by having been written for companies touring the provinces, though it has also been argued that companies were able to stage as complete performances in the provinces as they were in London.[8] The *Shrew* and *Henry VI* texts performed by the touring Pembroke's Men, by comparison, needed eleven adult actors and four boys,[9] so that the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* is anyway quite compact even if touring were an aspect affecting cast size. Dates later than 1593 would be difficult to defend in terms of quality of plotting.

[1] EKC ES 3, p.416, which records a performance that was probably on 6th January 1590. [2] Q.v. 7th September 1598 and 19th October 1598. [3] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1 say that the play "may be his first work for the stage; for its dramatic structure is comparatively unambitious, and while some of its scenes are expertly constructed, those involving more than, at the most, four characters betray an uncertainty of technique suggestive of inexperience". Shakespeare, William (2008q). The Two Gentlemen of Verona. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. pp.21–7 argues very strongly that *Verona* was Shakespeare's earliest play based on its negligence; but does not explain the apparent care. [4] Johnson, Samuel (1786). The Dramatick Writings of Will. Shakespeare. Vol. 2. p.vi, subtitled "With the Notes of all the various Commentators; Printed Complete from the best Editions of Sam. Johnson and Geo. Steevens." [5] Lyly, John (1592). Midas. EEBO, STC 17083. Title page. [6] Q.v. 1st January 1596. [7] Shakespeare, William (2004d). The Two Gentlemen of Verona. Carroll, William C. (ed.), Arden. p.285. [8] Thomson, Leslie (2010). Staging on the Road, 1586–1594: A New Look at Some Old Assumptions. Shakespeare Quarterly, 61.4. pp.526–50. [9] Shakespeare, William (2003i). The Taming of the Shrew. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Cambridge. p.2.

19th Feburary 1592 — Strange's Men start a season of performance at the Rose which runs until 22nd June 1592.

§ The dates are recorded in Henslowe's Diary,[1] the theatrical accounts book of Philip Henslowe, owner of the Rose theatre. This season is significant because Henslowe records details of the name of each play being performed, and the takings, and one of the plays may be from the Shakespearean canon. Strange's Men performed 23 individual plays in 105 performances in this season.[2] One of these plays was called

"harey the vj" by Henslowe, and was shown for the first time on 3rd March. There is evidence that this was the prequel of Shakespeare's Wars of the Roses plays, *1st Henry VI*.[3] The opening performance of the *Henry VI* play gave Henslowe the highest takings of the season, £3 16s 8d (920d). The second highest takings were from the first showing of the *Tanner of Denmark* on 23rd May, which came to £3 13s 6d (882d). *Henry VI* was a success, but not a disproportionately roaring success. After 22nd June, Strange's Men performed in the provinces, and on 24th June they were already performing at Rye in Sussex.[4] They returned to London to perform again at the Rose from 29th December 1592 to 1st February 1593.[5]

[1] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.16 for the opening date, and p.19 for the closing date. [2] Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.23. [3] Q.v. 3rd March 1592. [4] Louis, Cameron (2000). Sussex. Records of Early English Drama. p.136. Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.66 says they either toured, or were "idling in London, plucking the grass", but this was presumably written before the full REED records were available, which show a regular provincial tour by Strange's Men. [5] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.19 for the opening date, and p.20 for the closing date.

c.25th March 1592 — John Shakespeare is listed as a debtor, in a manuscript regarding recusants.

[*] HP O2, p.246 does not give a date, saying that the manuscript is undated, whereas SS CDL, p.41 dates it to "March or thereabouts". Joseph Pearce kindly points me to De Groot, John Henry (1946). The Shakespeares and "The Old Faith". p.52, which reads that the "Warwickshire Commission met at Warwick on February 27, 1592. It made its First Certificate at Easter (c. March 25)."

3rd March 1592 — Philip Henslowe records a performance of *Henry VI* as "ne" in his playhouse accounts diary.

§ Henslowe's diary entry is made complicated by two questions. To which play does he refer by "harey the vj"? And what is the meaning of "ne"? The temptation is to think of *Henry VI* as referring to one of the three plays featuring Henry VI that Shakespeare was involved with, since no other plays featuring Henry VI as the main character are known from the period.[1] But there are many other plays in Henslowe's diaries whose texts have not survived; Shakespeare often derived his plots from existing plays; and people also tried to capitalise on Shakespeare's success. It is also

important to note that Henslowe's diaries record no other Shakespearean plays, though this may be mitigated by the fact that *1st Henry VI*, if this is the play that Henslowe refers to, may have been an unusual collaboration,[2] which could therefore have formed part of a different repertory.

Despite these caveats, that the Henry VI trilogy was popular is clearly evident from two references to Henry VI plays in the period. Thomas Nashe mentions the popularity of a play with the character Talbot in *Pierce Penniless*, entered in the Stationers' Register on 8th August 1592,[3] and the only known play with this character is *1st Henry VI*, for which there is also very good evidence that Nashe wrote the first act.[4] The other reference is the allusion to *2 Contention* in the *Groatsworth of Wit* entered in the Stationers' Register on 20th September 1592.[5] Since the theatres had been closed from 23rd June 1592, we can discern from both of these works that the plays they mention were staged before that date. So as well as demonstrating that the plays were well known enough to be called popular and to be satirised, this also shows that they were on stage around the time that Henslowe recorded a performance of a Henry VI play in his playhouse accounts diary.

There is therefore a good possibility that the Henry VI play that Philip Henslowe mentions is one of Shakespeare's Henry VI plays. It may also be possible to specify which of those plays is most likely referred to. As well as the fact that *1st Henry VI* is unusual in terms of Shakespearean collaboration, there is another factor which points to it as the most likely referent. Roslyn Knutson pointed out in *Notes and Queries* that Henslowe generally did not give the part name of the first part of a play.[6] Since he does not give a part name here, he is either referring to *1 Contention* before *2 Contention* was written, or *1st Henry VI* which has a different title to the contention plays and is a prequel. But it is unlikely to be *1 Contention* since *1* and *2 Contention* must have been written and performed by 23rd June when the theatres were shut, in order for *2 Contention* to have been referred to in the *Groatsworth of Wit* later in the year. That would give only four months for both of the contention plays to be produced, if "ne" is used by Henslowe to denote a new play. On this basis, then, the identification of Henslowe's "harey the vj" as *1st Henry VI* is indeed the most likely, but fraught by

complexity just enough to ensure that caution must be taken in characterising the probability.

On the designation of the play as "ne", there is yet more uncertainty. The word "ne" is generally used by Henslowe to denote new, as it is often written next to a play which appears for the first time in his diary. But sometimes it appears twice, and therefore Henslowe may also be using it to denote the first performance of a revised play.[7] All the same, in the context of the three plays containing Henry VI, it is clear that that the plays were at the height of popularity at this time, and there are no known performances of the plays before 1592. It would make sense, if the play referred to by Henslowe is *1st Henry VI*, that it was the first performance of a new play, riding on the coat tails of the recent success of the other two Henry VI plays.

[1] Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.110, "No other play from this period is known to have featured Henry VI, so 'harey the vj' may be any of Shakespeare's Henry VI trilogy, but there is no definite proof this is the case." Schoone-Jongen's study is thorough and careful: he lists eight scholars who believe the play was 1H6, and only Bevington, Rutter, and Schoenbaum who are more cautious about whether it was one of the Shakespearean trilogy at all or not. [2] Taylor, Gary (1995). Shakespeare and Others. Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England, by Leeds Barroll (ed). p.169. [3] Arber 2, p.292 / 619. [4] Taylor, Gary (1995). Shakespeare and Others. Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England, by Leeds Barroll (ed). p.174. [5] Honan, p.158. [6] Knutson, Roslyn L. (1983). Henslowe's Naming of Parts. Notes and Queries, 228, pp.157–60. [7] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. pp.xxxiv–xxxv, who also suggests the possibility that it "refers to the licensing of a playbook for performance by the Master of the Revels."

7th March 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.16. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

11th March 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.16. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

16th March 1592 — A *Henry* play, possibly *Henry VI* though also possibly *Henry of Cornwall*, is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.17. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

28th March 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.17. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

3rd April 1592 — *Arden of Faversham*, with scenes occasionally attributed to Shakespeare, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.286 / 607, and Erne, Lukas (2001). Beyond the Spanish Tragedy: a Study of the Works of Thomas Kyd. p.59.

5th April 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.17. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

13th April 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.17. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

21st April 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.17. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

4th May 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.18. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

7th May 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.18. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

14th May 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.18. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

19th May 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.18. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

22nd May 1592 — John Clayton is loaned £7 by a William Shakespeare in Cheapside.

§ In 1600 a William Shakespeare sued John Clayton for the debt of £7 which was incurred by Clayton on 22nd May 1592.[1] The debt was acknowledged in writing on that date in the parish of "St. Mary Arches", i.e. St. Mary-le-Bow, in Cheapside, and later on the "Wednesday after the Quindene of Easter" in front of witnesses. Though the debtor was summoned, he did not appear, and he did not even send a lawyer to represent his case. Shakespeare, the claimant, was successful, and awarded twenty shillings in costs.[2] St. Mary-le-Bow was a small parish. Unfortunately, in an exceptionally detailed historical survey of the parish Keene and Harding do not mention a Clayton living there in that period.[3] Their information for the 1590s specifically is, however, quite sparse.

Clayton was a yeoman from the town of Willington, in Bedfordshire. Leslie Hotson found a William Shakespeare who lived eight miles from Willington, and thought that this might be the William Shakespeare of the debt case. This may be so, but E. A. J. Honigmann points out that both John and William Shakespeare were known money lenders, that William Shakespeare was not at this point a common name in London, and that there is no evidence that the Bedford Shakespeare was in London, whereas Shakespeare of Stratford "probably was". Honigmann points out that Lord Strange's Men played at Henslowe's Rose on this date, and that one of the parts of *Henry VI* was played on the 19th and 25th May.[4] The Rose is not in Cheapside, but if Shakespeare was with Strange's Men in this period then this may be further evidence that he was in the city when the lending occurred. If this was an action by Shakespeare the poet, Stopes points out that it was his "first independent lawsuit".[5]

[1] EKC F&P2, p.52. [2] Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1916). Shakespeare's Industry. p.259, who cites MS Coram Rege Roll, Easter, 42 Eliz. 1600. f.293. [3] Keene, D. J. and Harding, Vanessa (1987). Historical Gazetteer of London Before the Great Fire: Cheapside; parishes of All Hallows Honey Lane, St Martin Pomary, St Mary le Bow, St Mary Colechurch and St Pancras Soper Lane. pp.199–401. [4] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1988). "There Is a World Elsewhere": William Shakespeare, Businessman. In: Habicht, Werner and Palmer, David John (eds.). Images of Shakespeare. p.42. [5] Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1916). Shakespeare's Industry. p.259.

§ Keene and Harding do not have complete data for the use of all buildings in St. Mary-le-Bow in 1592, but what they do have points to a very small and residential parish with lettings.[1] This may point to the fact that either the lender or the debtor

were based in the parish at the time, if there were no public place such as a tavern where the transaction could have taken place. Since lettings seem to have been common here, and since the data is so patchy, a letting by either Clayton or Shakespeare—though presumably Clayton since he acknowledges the debt—could easily have slipped into the gaps in the records. It would be interesting to know where in London Shakespeare lived in this period.

[1] Keene, D. J. and Harding, Vanessa (1987). Historical Gazetteer of London Before the Great Fire: Cheapside; parishes of All Hallows Honey Lane, St Martin Pomary, St Mary le Bow, St Mary Colechurch and St Pancras Soper Lane. pp.199–401.

25th May 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

[*] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.18. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

11th June 1592 — There is a riot in Southwark by Clothworkers' Livery Company apprentices, possibly causing the Privy Council to close the theatres on 23rd June.

§ The apprentices had been "meeting at a play", but this "had been merely the excuse, not the cause of the riot" according to Carroll.[1] Strange's Men had performed *A Knack to Know a Knave* on 10th June, where Henslowe marks it "ne", but the date is interlined; perhaps it was performed on the 11th? On the 12th June they performed the *Henry VI* play.[2]

[1] Carroll, William C. (1996). Fat King, Lean Beggar: Representations of Poverty in the Age of Shakespeare. pp.142–3. [2] * Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.19.

12th June 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

[*] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.19. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

19th June 1592 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

[*] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.19. Cf. 3rd March 1592.

23rd June 1592 — The theatres are closed until 29th December.

§ The theatres were closed perhaps partly because of the riot on 11th June 1592 (q.v.), and perhaps partly due to plague.[1]

[1] Hyland, Peter (2003). An Introduction to Shakespeare's Poems. p.14.

24th July 1592 — John Shakespeare inventories the goods of Rafe Shaw.

* HP O2, p.245.

8th August 1592 — Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penniless*, which alludes to *1st Henry VI*, is entered into the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.292 / 619.

3rd September 1592 — Robert Greene dies.

* Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.18.

20th September 1592 — The *Groatsworth of Wit*, purportedly by Robert Greene and with a clear allusion to Shakespeare, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.292b / 620.

§ The *Groatsworth of Wit* is just one part of an interesting story concerning the literary milieu of the early 1590s. The focal point of this story is Henry Chettle, a master stationer who had served his apprenticeship under Thomas East between 1577 and 1584. Many years after this apprenticeship, Chettle worked in a partnership with William Hoskins and John Danter. This partnership did not even last a year, and so in late 1591 Chettle was without a place of business. He apparently fell out with Hoskins, because he continued to work in some capacity with Danter until at least 1596.[1]

On 7th August 1592, another printer, Abel Jeffes, was imprisoned. Chettle did not like Jeffes, who had some reputation as a bad stationer, and apparently took advantage of Jeffes's imprisonment. The day after Jeffes was imprisoned, a book called *Il Gerileon* was entered in the Stationers' Register.[2] This was by Anthony Munday, a friend of

Chettle's, and contained an epistle written by Chettle himself which praised Munday and derided Jeffes. In a peculiar move, however, this epistle was signed "T.N." which is clearly meant to implicate the writer Thomas Nashe.[3] On the same day that *Il Gerileon* was entered in the Stationers' Register, another book was entered: *Pierce Penniless*. This was certainly written by Nashe, and printed by none other than Abel Jeffes. *Pierce Penniless* had originally been printed by John Charlewood, but without Nashe's permission. Nashe took much offense at this, and commissioned an authorised copy to be printed by Jeffes as a consequence.[4]

Charlewood had in fact been a mentor to Munday, and had also been a source of encouragement to Chettle too since at least 1579.[5] It seems therefore that Chettle was standing up for Charlewood by writing a letter in Nashe's name accusing Jeffes of being a bad printer, on the very same day that Jeffes's edition of Nashe's work was entered in the Stationers' Register, and just one day after Jeffes was imprisoned. The knowledge that Nashe had used a disreputable printer was perhaps widespread, so that Chettle's signature would have been seen as a clear satire.

Just under a month later, on 3rd September, Robert Greene, a friend of Nashe and a renowned writer, died.[6] Before Greene died, in 1588, he had entered into a quarrel with Richard Harvey over the Martin Marprelate controversy. Martin Marprelate was an anti-episcopal pseudonym, and the Marprelate writing worried the government enough to employ anti-Marprelate writers, including Munday, Nashe, and Greene.[7] Richard Harvey suggested that Greene was unqualified to be one of the anti-Marprelate writers, and Greene responded with scathing satire.[8] John Lyly, a friend of Greene and Nashe, had even insinuated that Richard Harvey's brother Gabriel was Martin Marprelate.[9] There were clear dividing lines between two anti-Marprelate cliques, and this was the progenitor of the circumstances surrounding the *Groatsworth of Wit*. On the one side was Lyly, Greene, Nashe, and possibly Jeffes; on the other was, more loosely, Harvey, Munday, Charlewood, and Chettle.

[1] All from EKC ES 3, p.263. [2] Arber 2, p.292 / 619. [3] Later Chettle says of Nashe, "Neither was he the writer of an Epistle to the second part of Gerileon, though by the workemans error T. N. were set to the end: that I confesse to be mine, and repent it not." Chettle, Henry (1592). Kind-Heart's Dream. EEBO, STC 5123. Sig. A4v. [4] Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. Text, Vol.

15. pp.148–153, see especially footnote 36. [5] Celeste Turner Wright, Julia (1959). Young Anthony Munday Again. Studies in Philology, 56.2. p.152. "In 1579 the veteran encouraged another scribbler—apparently Henry Chettle, Mundy's future collaborator." Jowett characterises the findings of this paper as making Charlewood a father figure, which may be going too far. [6] Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.18. [7] Chainey, Graham (1995). A Literary History of Cambridge. p.18 for the involvement of Nashe and Greene, and Celeste Turner Wright, Julia (1959). Young Anthony Munday Again. Studies in Philology, 56.2. p.163 for the involvement of Munday. [8] Chainey, Graham (1995). A Literary History of Cambridge. p.18. [9] Stern, Virginia F. (1979). Gabriel Harvey: his Life, Marginalia, and Library. p.86.

§ When Greene died, opportunism apparently gripped the literary milieu. Gabriel Harvey wrote a book called *Four Letters, and Certain Sonnets* which lampooned Greene as having lived in squalor in his later years. Harvey moved fast, or at least wanted to give that impression, since the three fictional letters written after Greene's death on the 3rd are dated 5th, 8th/9th, and 11th/12th September. They were published by John Wolfe.[1] Wolfe had also published Greene's tract against Richard Harvey,[2] and Gabriel Harvey was working for and living with Wolfe when his own retort was published.[3]

On 20th September the *Groatsworth of Wit*, was entered in the Stationers' Register "vppon the perill of Henrye Chettle".[3] This is an odd phrasing which prefigures the intrigue to follow. The work was presented as a deathbed tract by Greene, part fable about a man named Roberto intended to represent the figure of Greene himself, and part admonition to contemporary writers.[4] The admonition is apparently addressed to Peele, Nashe, Marlowe, and Shakespeare, and is a kind of general invective against them, about which much has been written.[5] There are a multitude of indications that the work was mostly forged, probably by Chettle. There may have been some genuine fragmentary work that Chettle obtained, but it seems that the great majority of the work is by Chettle himself.[6] The first half of the work was produced by Wolfe and his printer: this is the half containing the fable of Roberto. The scandalous second half, with the admonitions to the writers, was printed by Danter. John Jowett suggests that Chettle deliberately wanted to keep Wolfe and Harvey from knowing about the scandalous section.[7]

[1] Harvey, Gabriel (1592). Four Letters, and Certain Sonnets. EEBO, STC 12900.5. pp.15, 50, and 62. [2] Lesser, Zachary (2004). Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication. p.120. [3] Arber 2, p.292b / 620. Cf. Jenkins, Harold (1935). On the Authenticity of Greene's Groatsworth of Wit and

The Repentance of Robert Greene. Review of English Studies, 11.41. p.32. Chauncey Sanders points out in Sanders, Chauncey (1933). Robert Greene and His "Editors". The Publications of the Modern Language Association, 48.2. p.396 that only one other Stationers' Register entry resembles this, where Richard Jones was allowed to enter a book where "the Company was doubtful about the right of Jones to print the work involved." He points out that this differs from the present case in that the publisher of the *Groatsworth of Wit*, William Wright, seemed to want to make sure that Chettle would be the scapegoat. [4] Greene, Robert (1592). Greene's Groats-Worth of Wit. EEBO, STC 12245. The majority of this book was most likely written by Henry Chettle. [5] Vickers, Brian (2004). Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays. p.140. That the author of the *Groatsworth of Wit*, ostensibly by Greene but probably written by Chettle, takes a potshot at Shakespeare may place Shakespeare in Nashe's literary circle. Of the three authors that Shakespeare is grouped with in the admonition, he collaborated with Peele and Nashe, and inn the case of Marlowe there is a possible link between his *Hero and Leander* and Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*. [6] Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. pp.25–6. [7] Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. Text, Vol. 15. p.154.

§ On 6th October, the *Repentance of Robert Greene* was entered in the Stationers' Register.[1] This was styled another deathbed tract by Greene, but has a peculiar background. A book by Greene had been entered in the Stationers' Register on 21st August, just before Greene died, called the *Repentance of a Coneycatcher*.[2] This was about one man named Mourton and another named Ned Browne. The section about Ned Browne was published later that year, not as *Repentance of a Coneycatcher* but as *The Black Book's Messenger*, and does not include anything about Mourton. The preface by Greene explains that the section on Mourton will be published soon, so perhaps he had been promising such a work to appear. The first half of the *Repentance of Robert Greene* sounds very much like the missing Mourton tract dressed up by some editor to look as though it is about Greene, whereas the second half is a hotchpotch which could conceivably contain genuine autobiographical material by Greene.[3]

The *Repentance of Robert Greene* was printed by Danter, the stationer who had apparently intended to print the work about Mourton.[4] Meredith Skura suggests that Chettle saw the two part document and was inspired to forge the *Groatsworth of Wit* in similar style.[5] John Jowett suggests that Chettle himself had an editorial hand in the *Repentance of Robert Greene*,[6] which perhaps better fits the continuity of events since otherwise the inspiration would have been printed after the work that was inspired by it. Perhaps, then, Danter having long been in possession of Greene's work intended to print it as

Greene intended, but decided instead to hand it over to Chettle for modification on the back of the success of the *Groatsworth of Wit*. This can only be speculation, and the involvement of Chettle in the production of the *Repentance of Robert Greene* is plausible rather than probable.

[1] Arber 2, p.293 / 621. [2] Arber 2, p.292 / 619. [3] Skura, Meredith Anne (2008). Tudor Autobiography. pp.216–7. [4] Jowett, John (1993). Johannes Factotum: Henry Chettle and Greene's Groatsworth of Wit. The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 87.4. pp.467–8. [5] Skura, Meredith Anne (2008). Tudor Autobiography. p.218. [6] Jowett, John (1993). Johannes Factotum: Henry Chettle and Greene's Groatsworth of Wit. The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 87.4. pp.477–8.

§ Chettle went on to publish an apology about the *Groatsworth of Wit* called the *Kindheart's Dream*.[1] This was again printed by Wolfe and Danter, and the more turbulent matter about Greene is again handled by Danter.[2] At this point the Harvey and Nashe quarrel starts to interact with Chettle's activities. In the *Kindheart's Dream*, Chettle entreats Nashe to "reuenge thy wrongs" because "thy aduersaries began the abuse, they continue it", speaking in the character of Greene's ghost as a literary trope.[3] Chettle also publicises the *Strange News* by Nashe, a retort to Harvey, which is printed by Danter.[4] Perhaps Chettle was trying to placate Nashe, who anyway later went on to call the *Groatsworth of Wit* a "scald trivial lying pamphlet", which he would probably not if it had been written by Greene.[5] At any rate, after some years, Chettle went on to become a compositor for Nashe, and addresses him in more or less friendly terms.[6] The battle between Harvey and Nashe, on the other hand, raged with unparalleled intensity amongst English letters.

[1] Cf. 8th December 1592. [2] Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. Text, Vol. 15. p.154. [3] Chettle, Henry (1592). Kind-Heart's Dream. EEBO, STC 5123. Sigs. E1v–E2r. The STC says that "Wolfe printed quires A–D; Danter the rest." The quotes are from Sig. E2r, printed by Danter. [4] Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. Text, Vol. 15. p.153, footnote 36. [5] The reference is in the 2nd edition of *Pierce Penniless*. A dissenting view is in Jenkins, Harold (1935). On the Authenticity of Greene's Groatsworth of Wit and The Repentance of Robert Greene. Review of English Studies, 11.41. p.32, who points out that Nashe said he was not Greene's companion "any more than for a carowse or two". [6] Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. Text, Vol. 15. p.156.

§ After advising figures identified as Marlowe, Nashe, and Peele to quit writing for the stage,[1] the author of the *Groatsworth of Wit* addresses them further and proceeds to the first written allusion to Shakespeare:

"Base minded men all three of you, if by my miserie ye be not warned: for vnto none of you (like me) sought those burres to cleaue: those Puppets (I meane) that speake from our mouths, those Anticks garnisht in our colours. Is it not strange that I, to whom they al haue beene beholding: is it not like that you, to whome they all haue beene beholding, shall (were yee in that case that I am now) bee both at once of them forsaken? Yet, trust them not: for there is an vpstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his *Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde*, supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and beeing an absolute *Iohannes fac totum*, is in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a countrey."[2]

The puppets that speak from their mouths, the mouths of the three playwrights and ostensibly Greene the author, are imitators of those established writers. But since these lines were probably written by Chettle, there is an hilarious irony introduced as the imitator makes the imitated scorn the act of imitation. The author moves on to the principal example of these imitators, Shakespeare. He is an upstart crow, a new playwright who wraps his own verse in feathers, ideas and idioms perhaps, plucked from the others. Moreover, this Shakespeare is only a mere player, but an arrogant one who thinks himself as good as the others, one that is a jack of all trades, and who is the only worthwhile writer in the country.

The close association of Marlowe, Nashe, and Greene is not surprising, but to include Peele in a clique opposed to Shakespeare is surprising since they had, as has been argued, collaborated on *Titus Andronicus* before the Henry VI sequence.[3] Moreover, Nashe seems only quite recently to have written the basis of *1st Henry VI* to which Shakespeare definitely contributed, and on which Peele may have collaborated too.[4] This does not necessarily mean that Nashe and Shakespeare had met or were on particularly friendly terms, and we see that Chettle himself was on increasingly good terms with Nashe through his life and yet speaks in very disapproving tones about

Marlowe.[5] Social circles could change quickly, however, and Chettle's motivations must also be considered.

The primary motive of Chettle seems to have been to cause controversy. The apology that Chettle published after the *Groatsworth of Wit* was his first work published under his own name,[6] and both works may have been quite popular: given that both Chettle and Nashe had been accused of writing the first pamphlet, and that both had to defend themselves,[7] this suggests that there was a wide readership and perhaps intense speculation. To spur controversy, Chettle would have to be close to the mark, and his caricature would have to be recognisable as satire of something worth being satirical about. Unfortunately there are only three pieces of potential biographical information in the passage, that Shakespeare was (i) a player, (ii) a jack of all trades, and (iii) conceited with his own work. The jack of all trades comment may simply be a repetition of the idea of Shakespeare being a player as well as a writer, if "and beeing" means that this is a summary of the previous clause. Perhaps it also means that Shakespeare was able to write in many styles, having already taken on comedy, tragedy, and history, or that he performed other playhouse jobs. What is most interesting is that the conceited behaviour is predicated on being the jack of all trades: being a jack of all trades, he is in his own opinion the only worthwhile scene-shaker. Reading the overall flow, the intent of the author was probably to taunt Shakespeare as being a player and writer, and the alleged conceit was likely from Shakespeare being so multitalented as a result.

Shakespeare's disposition may have struck a nerve with Chettle, who was concerned about hacks entering the publishing industry.[8] But if Chettle is worried about Shakespeare, then perhaps he is also worried about his own standing: he is working as a hack writer patching up fragments of a recently deceased author, and he is beautifying himself with Greene's feathers far more than Shakespeare had or would. Perhaps, then, this reflects the old adage about satirists only really satirising themselves, or perhaps it was a deliberate irony that was meant to be taken as less than the biting remark that at first glance it appears to be. We learn from Chettle's apology that he caused much offense anyway, probably including with Shakespeare,[9] and perhaps there is a further deferral in the very title of Chettle's apology, which he

calls *Kindheart's Dream*. Chettle is the kindheart, and he may have felt that he had inadvertantly or otherwise become a tiger's heart wrapped in a stationer's hide. The title of the apology could then be Chettle's way of pointing out the irony.

[1] The figures are alluded to, not named. The identifications as Peele, Nashe, and Marlowe occur variously, e.g. Honan, p.159, Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. p.1959, Tumelson, Ronald A. II (2008). Robert Greene, "Author of Playes". In: Melnikoff, Kirk, et al. (eds.). Writing Robert Greene. p.103. [2] Greene, Robert (1592). Greene's Groats-Worth of Wit. EEBO, STC 12245. pp.138–9. This book was most likely in fact by Henry Chettle. [3] Cf. c.1590, the writing of *Titus Andronicus*. [4] Cf. c.1592, the writing of *1st Henry VI*. [5] Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. Text, Vol. 15. p.155–6 for Chettle and Nashe, and "With neither of them that take offence was I acquainted, and with one of them I care not if I neuer be" in Chettle, Henry (1592). Kind-Heart's Dream. EEBO, STC 5123. Sig. A3v for Chettle and Marlowe, if the one with whom Chettle does not desire to be acquainted is taken to be Marlowe. [6] Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. Text, Vol. 15. p.147. [7] Chettle in Chettle, Henry (1592). Kind-Heart's Dream. EEBO, STC 5123, Nashe in Nashe, Thomas (1592). Pierce Penilesse his supplication to the diuell. EEBO, STC 18372. [8] Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. Text, Vol. 15. p.150–1, though this argument is tenuous. [9] Chettle, Henry (1592). Kind-Heart's Dream. EEBO, STC 5123. Sig. A3v.

25th September 1592 — John Shakespeare is named in a fair copy of the c.March list of recusants.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.39. Cf. HP O2, p.245.

8th December 1592 — Henry Chettle's *Kindheart's Dream*, with an apology to Shakespeare regarding the *Groatsworth of Wit*, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.294 / 623.

29th December 1592 — Strange's Men start a period of performance at the Rose which runs until 1st February 1593, and the theatres had therefore been reopened by now.

* The theatres had closed on 23rd June 1592 (q.v.). Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.19 for the opening date, and p.20 for the closing date, of the performances by Strange's Men.

1593

1593 — *Venus and Adonis* is written and published.

* Published by 12th June 1593 (q.v.).

§ Wells and Taylor argue that the poem was written in 1592 when the theatres shut for the first time in the summer.[1] It would not, however, have been clear at that time that the closures would last for so long. It is more likely on balance, therefore, that Shakespeare wrote and completed *Venus and Adonis* not long before it was published.

[1] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.223.

§ Richard Field, the printer of *Venus and Adonis*, was born in Stratford in November 1561, and was therefore just a few years Shakespeare's elder. He was apprenticed to printer George Bishop for seven years in 1579, but was to serve the first six of those seven years under another printer, Thomas Vautrollier.[1] Field was released from apprenticeship in February 1587, Vautrollier died that July, and next year Field published a work with Jacqueline Vautrollier.[2] In January 1589, Field married a Jacqueline Vautrollier, perhaps the same one with whom he had published a work the year before. There is some ambiguity, however, as to whether Field married Thomas's widow or his daughter. George Wyndham states, in an introduction to Shakespeare's poems published in 1898:[3]

"In 1588 he married, says Ames, 'Jaklin, d. of Vautrollier' (*Typographical Antiquities*, ed. Herbert, ii. 1252) and succeeded him in his house 'in the Black Friers, neer Ludgate.' Collier quotes the marriage register—R. Field to Jacklin, d. of Vautrilliam 12 Jan. 1588. It is stated, however, in a list of master-printers included in the 'Stationers' Register' (transcript, iii. 702) that Field married Vautroullier's widow, and succeeded him in 1590."

The work by Ames is from 1749, who says that Thomas "married his daughter Jakin to Richard Field".[4] But Wyndam quotes Collier inaccurately. Collier does not record

the marriage register as stating that Jacklin was Thomas's daughter, and actually quoted the marriage register of St. Paul's Church-yard as: "Married: Richard Field to Jacklin Vautrillian, 12 Jan., 1588."[5] He does, however, add the suggestion himself that she was Thomas's daughter in his accompanying notes. This means that only Ames says that Jacqueline was the daughter of Vautrollier. Yet the entry in the Stationers' Register contradicts it and says that she was his widow, which is the most generally agreed upon circumstance.[6] Stopes, however, gives several good reasons to suggest that the Jacqueline that Field married was, in fact, Thomas's daughter.[7]

[1] All from Eccles, p.59, who gives Field's baptism on the 16th. [2] Nicholl, Charles (2007). The Lodger. p.175. [3] Wyndham, George (ed.) (1898). The Poems of Shakespeare. p.xxvii. [4] Ames, Joseph (1749). Typographical Antiquities. Vol. 2. p.1065. [5] Collier, John Payne (1853a). Lives of the Original Actors in Shakespeare's Plays. p.223. [6] It has been generally accepted throughout the 20th century and early 21st century that the Jacqueline Vautrollier whom Field married was Thomas's widow. This is based on study of over a dozen sources on the issue; for example Eccles, p.59 and Honan, p.322 both give Jacqueline as Thomas's widow. The only exceptions in this study were Duncan-Jones (2001). Ungentle Shakespeare. p.114, who says that Jacqueline was "either his dead master's widow or daughter", and Clark, Alice (1968). The Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century. pp.163, who stated that Field married his daughter, based on Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1907). Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries. p.7. [7] Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1907). Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries. p.7 says: "Elsewhere it is stated that he married the daughter. This seems more likely for two reasons: first, because Richard Field's widow 'Jakin' succeeded him, when he died in 1625, and carried on the business; and second, because of the remarkable statement that 'Thomas Vautrollier was no printer when he died.' It makes one think that Vautrollier must already have handed over his business with his daughter to Richard Field."

§ On 21st September 1593, William Reynolds mentioned having read *Venus and Adonis* in a letter to Lord Burghley. The letter was discovered by Leslie Hotson amongst the papers of Lord Burghley in a sequence of letters from various individuals making a plea for royal favour. Many of the letters were from people not of sound mind, and William Reynolds appears to have been amongst these. He was a soldier, had served in several campaigns, and was seeking further employ. He claims to have sent 200 letters over seven years to bishops, doctors, and preachers about the "sodometicall sines over flowing" throughout England. He was often imprisoned, but continued his career and seems to have become slightly more balanced, at least in his letter writing, later in life.[1] In 1593 he was somewhat preoccupied with Queen Elizabeth, blamed her for

various problems with the nation, thought she was out to seduce him, and saw Shakespeare's Venus as a thin allegory for her:

"Also w[ith]in thees few dayes ther is another boke made of Venus and Adonis wherin the queene represents the person of Venus, w[hich] queene is in great loue (forsoth) w[ith] adonis, and greatly desiares to kise him, and she woes him most intierly, teling him allthough she be oulde, yet she is lustie freshe & moyst, full of love & life (I beleve a goodell more then a bushell full) and she can trip it as lightly as a phery nimphe upon the sandes and her foote stepes not seene, and much ado w[ith] redde & whyte, But adonis regardid her not, wherfore she condemnes him for unkindnesse, thoes bookes are mingled with other stufe to daesell the matter"[2]

Since Reynolds is so swept up by his own internal narrative, it would be inadvisable to read his thoughts on *Venus and Adonis* as at all typical of contemporary reaction to the work. Beyond the main plot and the allegory which to him seems so obvious, Reynolds's summary is also really no more than a passing review of one work amongst several in a general condemnation of books then on the bookstalls. It is strange that Reynolds would say that the book was released within the previous few days, since Richard Stonley had bought a copy on 12th June 1593 (q.v.).

[1] Duncan-Jones, Katherine (1993). Much Ado with Red and White. Review of English Studies, 44.176. pp.479–81. [2] Duncan-Jones, Katherine (1993). Much Ado with Red and White. Review of English Studies, 44.176. pp.488.

c.1593 — *Love's Labour's Lost* is written.

§ The most obvious internal feature of *Love's Labour's Lost* which potentially points to a date of composition is the character of the King of Navarre. On 25th July 1593 Henry IV, the real King of Navarre, had converted to Catholicism.[1] This had made him an enemy of Elizabeth I, who had been his ally, and was serious political news. Unfortunately there does not seem to be any consensus as to whether this would have made it more or less likely for the king to be portrayed on the stage. H. R. Woudhuysen, for example, says that it is very unlikely that the king would have been a popular stage figure until the end of 1594 when there was an assassination attempt

made on him which brought him back into some sympathy with the English.[2] On the other hand, Mary Ellen Lamb has argued that the theme of oath breaking relates to Navarre's breaking of his religious oath to Protestantism and the cause of the French wars.[3]

Thankfully, though the Navarre reference is the most prominent of the datable internal evidence, it is not the only evidence. Richard David provides a very good summary of the other parallels, and suggests that this dates the play to 1593, into 1594.[4] On the question of Navarre, he takes a similar stance to the later editor Woudhuysen, but also notes that the English troops sent to assist Henri IV were not withdrawn until November 1593, so sympathy would still at least have been with the troops. Moth's joke in Act 3.1 is said to relate to London riots against the Huguenots, which took place in September 1586, May 1593, and June 1595. Only the latter two make sense here, and 1595 would be rather late unless this is a revised scene, so the scene most comfortably relates to the riots of May 1593. Allusions to Thomas Nashe's *Pierce's Penilesse* and Gabriel Harvey's *Pierce's Supererogation*, the latter of which was published in October 1593, further help to ground the play in 1593.[5]

The only counter-evidence to a 1593 date is the inclusion of two probable references to the Night of Errors saga on 28th December 1594 (q.v.). The mock embassy of Muscovites accompanied by blackamoors, and Rosaline's jibe about sea-sickness, both in Act 5.2, are seen to be references to the events of that night, which would mean that either the play was written after that, or this scene was a later addition. David argues for addition, noting that the "doublets in the text, the apparent reshaping of certain scenes, and the variations in speech-headings" point to revision; and he adduces evidence to indicate that revision of the play took place in 1597.[6]

It is surprising that David's arguments did not find favour with later scholars. David was writing in the Arden 2nd series, and by the 3rd series Woudhuysen was disclaiming the Navarre link, and accepting the Night of Errors link as the main possibility of dating the play: though, remarkably, he claims that it is impossible to tell whether the play influenced the night, or the night the play![7] The latter is the only scenario that makes sense, unless we believe that the Prince of Purpoole, elected as

part of the celebrations, would have used, as an excuse of the night's activities, a reference to a small throwaway line in another recent play by Shakespeare. On balance this must be considered extremely unlikely. Similarly, Woudhuysen gives no room to David's argument that Act 5.2 is a later revision to the play. To ignore almost wholesale the findings of a predecessor indicates that either the earlier evidence was then discounted, or new evidence was found, but there are no indications in the literature that either has taken place. David's arguments for late 1593, or perhaps early 1594, stand.

[1] Love, Ronald S. (2001). Blood and Religion: The Conscience of Henri IV, 1553–1593. p.4. [2] Shakespeare, William (1998b). Love's Labour's Lost. Woudhuysen, H. R. (ed.), Arden. p.60. [3] Lamb, Mary Ellen (1985). The Nature of Topicality in 'Love's Labour's Lost'. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 38. p.56. [4] Shakespeare, William (1968a). Love's Labour's Lost. David, Richard (ed.), Arden. p.xxviii. Compare this to Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.307, who suggest that the play was written "in 1594 or 1595". [5] Shakespeare, William (1968a). Love's Labour's Lost. David, Richard (ed.), Arden. pp.xxv–xxvi. [6] Shakespeare, William (1968a). Love's Labour's Lost. David, Richard (ed.), Arden. pp.xxvii–xxviii. [7] Shakespeare, William (1998b). Love's Labour's Lost. Woudhuysen, H. R. (ed.), Arden. pp.59–61.

c.1593 — *Love's Labour's Won* is written.

§ In the overall progression of Shakespeare's creative output, *Love's Labour's Won* occupies a pivotal position. To make this clear it is worth taking a brief subjective look at the plays from the beginning of Shakespeare's literary career to the few years following *Love's Labour's Won*.

Shakespeare started off with a comedy and a tragedy, *Shrew* and *Titus Andronicus*, neither of which approach the average of Shakespeare's ability despite the cultural popularity of the former. These are followed by two solid history plays, *1* and *2 Contention*, which were popular with playgoers and perhaps boosted Shakespeare's confidence enough to follow them with *Richard III*, Shakespeare's first substantial artistic achievement as a playwright. The closure of the theatres soon after the writing of *Richard III* may have motivated Shakespeare to write the delicate lyrical comedy *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and the more prestigious lyric poems. The two lyric poems boosted Shakespeare's

creativity and perhaps his reputation further too; they were certainly aimed at noble patronage. The next play that he wrote was another comedy, *Love's Labour's Lost*. This was his most ambitious endeavour to date, but was in some ways a failed experiment, being too dependant on wordplay and cultural reference, blunting its universal impact despite being an outstanding display of literary pyrotechnics. Then follows *Love's Labour's Won*. After the smaller project of the *Comedy of Errors* come, in 1595, *Romeo and Juliet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *Richard II*, a tragedy, comedy, and history conducted further in the lyric mode. With these lyric plays Shakespeare's creative output and ability had undergone one of the greatest shifts of his career. The plays before 1595 express an earlier stage of development in Shakespeare's writing. The question therefore becomes whether *Love's Labour's Won* was a play more like the group between *Shrew* and *Love's Labour's Lost*, or whether it was a transition or a full move into the dramatic and linguistic styles that are evident from 1595 and which continue thereafter. Since the text of *Love's Labour's Won* is lost, the answer cannot be known for sure without further discoveries. But the fact that *Love's Labour's Won* was not preserved for publication in the First Folio, and that no copies survive, perhaps indicates that it was a continuation of what is characterised here as the failed experiment of *Love's Labour's Lost*.

In such a concise and subjective tour of Shakespeare's early work, there must of course be points of contention. Some critics find *Titus Andronicus* better than others; *Richard III* may not have been written at the suggested point; and *Love's Labour's Lost* was perhaps produced under circumstances that made its peculiarities less detrimental. But generally speaking, the majority of critics ought to find an easy distinction in the plays before 1595 and those written in that year and after. It then becomes unwise to ignore the fact that *Love's Labour's Won* is the last play written before this phase shift, if not the first one in it, and yet is also, so tantalisingly, the only play we suspect was written entirely by Shakespeare whose text is not known to survive. *Love's Labour's Won* is a potentially very important play in the canon, and one whose absence due to missing text ought as far as possible to not be used as an excuse for the lack of consideration as a piece of Shakespeare's overall career.

28th January 1593 — The theatres are ordered to close due to a severe outbreak of plague in London.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.69.

§ Sussex's Men obtained permission to play outside London on 29th April 1593, and the Admiral's Men obtained permission to play outside London on 6th May 1593 though they had in fact already been on the road for several days.[1]

[1] Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.70.

31st January 1593 — A *Henry VI* play is performed at the Rose.

* Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. p.19. Cf. 3rd March 1592. The last performance by Strange's Men before the theatre closures was on 1st February 1593.

1st February 1593 — Strange's Men perform their last play of the year at the Rose, Marlowe's the *Jew of Malta*, before the theatres close due to plague.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.69.

§ They then toured the provinces, playing in Chelmsford in April or May, Rye in July, Bath in August, Coventry on 2nd December, and Cauldon Castle in December according to Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. pp.216–7.

18th April 1593 — *Venus and Adonis* is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.297b / 630, and SS R&I, p.208.

30th May 1593 — Christopher Marlowe is murdered.

* Honan, Park (2005). Christopher Marlowe: Poet & Spy. pp.343–355.

12th June 1593 — Richard Stonley buys a copy of *Venus and Adonis*, the first recorded purchase of a Shakespeare work.

* SS DL, p.131 and SS CDL, p.176 contain a facsimiles and commentary. Cf. Hyland, Peter (2003). An Introduction to Shakespeare's Poems. p.64, and Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems. p.436.

20th June 1593 — Thomas Nash, who would later marry Shakespeare's only granddaughter Elizabeth Hall, is baptised.

* Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. pp.432. "Nash, Thomas (1593–1647), the eldest son of Anthony Nash, was baptised at Stratford parish church on 20 June, 1593: 'Thomas filius Anthonij Nash generosi'."

25th September 1593 — Ferdinando, Lord Strange, becomes the 5th Earl of Derby, so his acting company become known as Derby's Men.

* Erne, Lukas (2003). Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist. p.93.

28th September 1593 — Pembroke's Men had fallen on hard times, according to Philip Henslowe.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.77, and cf. 6th February 1594.

5th December 1593 — Strange's Men play at Caludon Castle in Warwickshire, their last recorded performance.

* Shakespeare, William (2009b). Richard III. Siemon, James R. (ed.), Arden. p.49. Siemon also says that two days later their plays begun to be entered in the Stationers' Register, citing Arber 2, p.303 / 641, which refers to *Orlando Furioso*, and to cf. Manley, Lawrence (2003). From Strange's Men to Pembroke's Men: 2 Henry VI and The First part of the Contention. Shakespeare Quarterly, 54.3. pp.253–87.

26th December 1593 — The theatres, closed since 1st February due to the plague, reopen for a short winter season, being closed again on 3rd February 1594, and Sussex's Men start performing at The Rose, performing *Titus Andronicus* amongst other plays.

* Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.82. Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.77–79 says 27th December.

1594

1594 — *The Rape of Lucrece* is written.

* Cf. 9th May 1594.

1594 — Henry Peacham signs a drawing and dialogue excerpt from *Titus Andronicus*.

* Facsimile in SS DL, p.122. Dated by an interpretation of the original chronogram, "Anno m° q° q [or g] q^to", and *not* of the endorsement "Henrye Peachams Hande 1595" which is thought to be a forgery, though ruled out as a Collier forgery by Freeman, Arthur, and Freeman, Janet Ing (2004). John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century. Vol. 1. p.1038.

§ There are seven figures in the drawing. To the left are two men dressed in military garb, then a grand figure with a spear, a crowned kneeling woman, two kneeling men, and a standing moor with a sword.[1] The identification of this scene with Titus Andronicus is due to the inclusion of 43 lines of text, mostly from that play, below the drawing.[2] Two of these lines are an otherwise unknown stage direction, followed by Tamora's plea from Act 1.1 with some of the response, then two unknown joining lines, and Aaron's speech from Act 5.1 but without its first line, and with "&c&c" after it. The final line consists of the name Alarbus, a player who does not speak in the play as we know it, and which may have been intended as a speech prefix, though no text follows it. The text in general does not precisely follow any of the quarto or folio texts, but could be characterised as mixing features from Q1 and F1. As well as the two unknown lines which merely join the two speeches, two of the lines in Aaron's speech have readings not attested in any other known text.

The impression of the whole is that it forms a unified single scene. Unless, however, the play was greatly modified after this manuscript was made, it must in fact be a pastiche. In the plea scene from Act 1.1, Alarbus and the sons of Titus should be present. The two men standing behind the grand figure, who must be Titus, may be his sons, but John Dover Wilson argues based on their costume that they are in fact soldiers. Alarbus is apparently not depicted. Tamora is the crowned woman kneeling, and the two men kneeling behind her are presumably her sons Chiron and Demetrius. In Act 1.1, Aaron is a prisoner of war, and yet in the drawing he is a free, armed

man.[3] The drawing seems, therefore, to be a pastiche of the play just as much as the text below it. It is not known whether the text was added when the drawing was made or whether it was added afterwards, and nor is it entirely clear whether it was Henry Peacham who penned both.

[1] Cooper, Tarnya (ed.) (2006). Searching for Shakespeare. p.147 gives a large colour reproduction of the manuscript. [2] There is a pencil note on the manuscript naming Titus Andronicus directly, but this is in a much later hand. [3] The identifications, including the Wilson quote, are summarised from Shakespeare, William (2002e). Titus Andronicus. Waith, Eugene M. (ed.), Oxford. pp.21–2.

§ The chronogram underneath Peacham's signature reads "Anno m^{o} q^{o} q [or g] q^{to}".[1] This chronogram is regarded as genuine.[2] The endorsement "Henrye Peachams Hande 1595" elsewhere on the manuscript is, on the other hand, considered a forgery,[3] and as as such cannot be used to support the interpretation of the chronogram. The first two parts of the chronogram stand for millesimo quingentesimo, which are 1000 and 500 respectively.[4] Berry suggested that the final element, q^{to}, stands for quarto (four).[5] Miller disputes this, suggesting that q^{to} stands for quinto (five), since quarto (four) would be spelled q^{rto}.[6] The comprehensive list of Latin abbreviations in *The Record Interpreter* by Charles Trice Martin, however, gives q̃r^{o} and q̃rto for quarto (p.123), and q^{i}nto (p.119) and v^{to} (p.158) for quinto.[7] This element therefore most likely refers to quarto.

The penultimate element is the most difficult to interpret, and is most likely either the letter q or g. Chambers thought this was a 9,[8] but an "n" or "n^{o}" for nonogesimo (ninety) would be standard. Since the thousands and hundreds place the date in the 16th century, and since it ends with quarto, a "4", 1594 can be the only possible date, and the mystery of the q or g (or 9) must be counted amongst the many other minor Shakespearean mysteries.

[1] Cooper, Tarnya (ed.) (2006). Searching for Shakespeare. p.147, with a facsimile. [2] Freeman, Arthur, and Freeman, Janet Ing (2004). John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century. Vol. 1. p.1038 say that Charles Hamilton "went so far as to accuse Collier of forging not only the endorsement but also the marginal 'Henricus Peacham Anno m^{o} q^{o} g q^{to}'; but his reasoning is unpersuasive." [3] Freeman, Arthur, and Freeman, Janet Ing (2004). John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century. Vol. 1. p.1038 rule out Collier forgery, which had been considered by e.g. Metz, G. Harold (1985). Titus Andronicus: A Watermark in the Longleat

Manuscript. Shakespeare Quarterly, 36.4. p.450. Freeman and Freeman do not pronounce on whether the endorsement is a forgery. [4] Foakes, R. A. (1985). Illustrations of the English Stage, 1580–1642. p.48. [5] Berry, Herbert (1999). The Date on the 'Peacham' Manuscript. Shakespeare Bulletin, Vol. 17. pp.5–6. [6] Suggested by Clarence Miller, via Shakespeare, William (2002e). Titus Andronicus. Waith, Eugene M. (ed.), Oxford. p.23. [7] Martin, Charles Trice (1910). The Record Interpreter: A collection of abbreviations, Latin words and names used in English historical manuscripts and records. pp.119, 123, and 158. [8] EKC F&P1, p.313.

§ The Peacham manuscript was found amongst the papers of Sir Michael Hicks,[1] patronage secretary to Lord Burghley in this period.[2] There is no evidence indicating how Hicks came into possession of the manuscript, but as secretary he did end up with a large amount of documentation.[3] He was also described as "a very witty and jocose man, whose company was sought after by persons of rank and fashion",[4] so perhaps he ended up with the manuscript due to personal interest rather than official duty. Yet he may have had access to it due to his important standing.

[1] Kay, Dennis (1992). Shakespeare: His Life, Work and Era. p.104. [2] Couchman, Jane and Crabb, Ann (2005) Women's Letters Across Europe, 1400–1700. p.159. [3] See e.g. Cooper, C. P. (1832). An Account of the Most Important Public Records of Great Britain. Vol. 1. p.116 and Pryor, Felix (2003). Elizabeth I: Her Life in Letters. p.8. [4] Burke, John (1844). A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies of England, Ireland, and Scotland. 2nd edition. p.263. No source is given for the quote, and Jeaffreson, John Cordy (ed.) (1892). Sir Baptist Hicks. Middlesex County Records. Vol. 4. p.331 gives a slightly different version.

§ There are several interesting readings in the Peacham manuscript. The manuscript's use of "sonne" and "sonnes" is closer to F1 than Q1, as is the word "Thy" in place of "But", and "haystackes" instead of "haystalks". On the other hand the use of "their teares" instead of "the teares" is closer to Q1 than F1. The two lines that differ substantially from both Q1 and F1 which agree against it are as follows:

Euen almost when theire sorrowes was forgott
And on their brestes as on the barke of trees

(Peacham Manuscript)

Euen when their sorrowes almost was forgot,
And on their skinnes, as on the Barke of Trees,

(First Folio)

The dialogue seems therefore to be derived from a source other than the currently known printed works, unless the copying was peculiarly *variatim*. All of the F1 readings that the manuscript follows make more sense than the equivalent reading in Q1, and the one Q1 reading that it follows makes more sense than F1. This means that whatever source Peacham used, it was more reliable than any printed version that we know of. Q1 was printed in 1594, so it was possibly available and yet it was not used. But there is also the question of the more substantial difference quoted above, which is hard to judge in terms of its relation to the received text. The ordering of the words sounds cruder in the first line of the Peacham version, but breasts in the second line has alliteration with bark. On the other hand the imagery of skin is cruder, and better suited to the sense of the passage overall. The case for the passage in Peacham being an earlier version may, therefore, be a little better than it being later. But this would not explain why Peacham would use an older form than printed in Q1 if it were available, unless he wrote earlier in the year, did not have access to a copy, or avoided it for some other reason. Nor does it explain why the text is in such a fine state compared to the printed versions.

c.1594 — *The Comedy of Errors* is written.

§ On 28th December 1594, Grey's Inn staged a performance of a "Comedy of Errors (like to *Plautus* his *Menechmus*)" as part of the Christmas revels.[1] The Lord Chamberlain's Men, formed by about June of this year,[2] had performed "twoe seuerall comedies or Enterludes" in front of the Queen on 26th and 28th December.[3] Since Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* is indeed based on the *Menechmi* by Plautus, in all likelihood the Grey's Inn performance was of Shakespeare's play, which also makes the record of the revels the first ever notice of a source of a Shakespearean play.[4] The comedies or interludes played before the queen perhaps included the *Comedy of Errors* too.[5]

[1] Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. pp.1962–3. According to Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.285, commenting on the Grey's Inn performance, since *The Comedy of Errors* is exceptional in "having no cues for music, it may have been written for the occasion, or at least have been new in 1594". [2] Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.39. [3] EKC ES 4, p.164. [4] Dutton, Richard (2009). The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre. p.284. There is some disagreement about the date of the court performances, as the Lord Chamberlain's Men are said to have performed at court on this day, along with another company. Probably the date in the records is wrong. As Chambers says in EKC F&P2, p.319, the "record gives Innocents' Day, December 28, but an error for 27 is probable, in view of the Gray's Inn record, and of the fact that a payment to the Admiral's for December 28 also appears." [5] Phillips, O. Hood (1972). Shakespeare and the Lawyers. p.25.

§ In the middle of the 20th century, Sidney Thomas argued strongly that the *Comedy of Errors* was written in 1594 specifically for the Grey's Inn performance of the same year.[1] An analysis of his long argument shows that he advances eight separate points in support of this thesis, which are here abstracted from his narrative, amplified, and commented upon:

(i) The Christmas revels at Grey's Inn were prepared for several months in advance. They were in fact bigger in this year than they had been for many years previously, and much fuss was made about them. The Christmas revels are often considered without their full context, simply as the setting for a performance of a Shakespearean play, whereas a closer look at the full proceedings shows them to have been a significant event. Francis Bacon, of Grey's at the time, wrote speeches for the pageantry. The Queen ordered a peel of ordnance to be let off for the coordinator of the revels, the Prince of Purpoole. That so much was done to make the revels a success might indicate that the pieces commissioned for the revels, such as Bacon's speeches, included also the play performed on the night of the 28th.

(ii) The members of the Inns of Court were inveterate playgoers, and as such would have expected new entertainment for the revels, not something that they had seen many times before on the public stage. This is a weak argument, since if they would see a play many times on the public stage then why not see it again during the revels? The argument is still nonetheless valid since it would be more credit to the revels if

there were a specially commissioned new play for the event, and it was not beyond the power of the Inns to commission such a thing.

(iii) The *Comedy of Errors* is Shakespeare's shortest play, by a considerable margin: it is the only play under 2000 lines, at 1777 lines.[2] Moreover, the play was designed for a very limited stage, with no varied scenery required. This could indicate that it was written for the Grey's Inn stage. On the other hand it could indicate that the play was written for a company on tour, though there is also dissent about this view.[3] Thomas assumes that if this were so, then the play would have to be an abridgement, that only short versions of longer plays were shown in the provinces, but there is no reason why a play could not be written for touring. The *Comedy of Errors* has so intricate a plot that it could not very likely be an abridgement of a larger play, which means that it was probably written at the length at which we receive it. Altogether, this point is valid evidence for a performance intended for Grey's Inn.

(iv) The play has more legal references than any other play. Though Shakespeare often used legal references in his plays, the fact that the *Comedy of Errors* has more than any other is again maybe indicative of a performance amongst legal society. What is perhaps most interesting along this line, that Thomas does not point out, is that the play is also quite simple in its comedy. The comic capers of the Dromio twins especially are of the buffoon type and permeate the play. There is none of the intellectual flashing wit and wordplay of *Love's Labour's Lost* or even the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and yet there are many legal references. This point may counteract was well as reinforce Thomas's argument, since a play written for the Inns might be expected to be intellectual in general, as well as having many legal references.

(v) The *Comedy of Errors* is Shakespeare's closest deliberate imitation of a classical author. Thomas contradicts himself in his argument here somewhat. On the one hand he argues that it is the closest imitation, but to protect himself from the play being too early, he also argues that it is a masterful elaboration of the classical original. At the very least, the choice of a play by Plautus on which to base the *Comedy of Errors* is consonant with being performed successfully in the Inns. Indeed, since the revels commentator noted the source of the play, the first time that a source was known to

have been noted for a Shakespearean play, perhaps the play was advertised on the night as being derived from Plautus; at least the link was clear and recognised. This would further underline the importance of the classical allusion.

(vi) On 10th June 1594, William Warner's translation of *Menechmi* was entered in the Stationers' Register.[4] This was printed in 1595. Thomas says that it is generally recognised that there are verbal parallels between Warner's translation and Shakespeare's play enough that "make it seem likely" that Shakespeare had read Warner before writing his play. Thomas cites Chambers for this, but Chambers actually says that the verbal resemblances "are trifling, and may well be accidental", though the preliminary verse by Warner claims "much pleasant error", which Chambers perhaps means as a source for Shakespeare's title.[5] In 21st century scholarship the question is still undecided, with a brief survey by Charles Whitworth indicating that the issue is complex enough not to have an obvious resolution—he cites one author for, one against, and one abstaining.[6] But Warner's work was published in 1595. Chambers suggests that the play was circulated in manuscript, as indicated by the printer's preface saying that it was made "for the use and delight of his private friends" by the translator.[7] Thomas on the other hand argues that the close fidelity of the Stationers' Register entry and subsequent title page indicates that there was an earlier edition that the Stationers' Register entry was transcribed from, citing an expert on early modern publication to this effect. Perhaps both explanations are correct. Whatever the case of the level of borrowing, this is not the most important feature. What is most pertinent is that Warner finished and had registered a translation of *Menechmi* in June 1594, and the close proximity of this to the Grey's Inn performance begs a connection. As Charles Whitworth says, the "coincidence of dates as well as their common source makes it difficult to maintain the assumption that neither author knew a thing about the other's work".[8] Warner's work was printed by Thomas Creede, who in the same year printed the bad *1 Contention* edition, and the next year the bad *2 Contention*. He also entered *Locrine*, with its strange credit to "W.S.", on 20th July 1594, and it was printed the next year.

(vii) Shakespeare probably used Laurence Twine's *Pattern of Painful Adventures* as a source, the earliest printing of which is undated and yet evidently belongs to the 1590s. He

would later work on *Pericles* with George Wilkins using the same source. Despite the lack of date, context and printing devices give Thomas grounds to think that the edition belongs to 1594.

(viii) The name of Dromio is taken from Lyly's play *Mother Bombie*, which was written around 1589. The Stationers' Register entry for this play is 18th June 1594,[9] and no edition is known of before that date. Shakespeare, being acquainted with the stage, could have known about Lyly's play at any point, but again the coincidence of the 1594 date cumulatively strengthens the case. The *Comedy of Errors* was most likely written in 1594.

[1] Thomas, Sidney (1956). The Date of The Comedy of Errors. Shakespeare Quarterly, Vol. 7. pp.380–2. [2] Hart, Alfred (1932). The Number of Lines in Shakespeare's Plays. Review of English Studies, 8.29. p.21. [3] Thomson, Leslie (2010). Staging on the Road, 1586–1594: A New Look at Some Old Assumptions. Shakespeare Quarterly, 61.4. pp.526–50. [4] Arber 2, p.309 / 653. [5] EKC F&P2, p.311. [6] Shakespeare, William (2003h). The Comedy of Errors. Charles Whitworth (ed.), Oxford. p.21. [7] EKC F&P2, p.311. [8] Shakespeare, William (2003h). The Comedy of Errors. Charles Whitworth (ed.), Oxford. p.21. [9] Arber 2, p.309b / 654.

23rd January 1594 — Henslowe records a performance, which he marks as "ne", of *Titus Andronicus* by Sussex's Men at the Rose.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.77–79.

§ The word "ne" is very likely an abbreviation of "new", but since *Titus Andronicus* was probably written before this year (q.v. c.1590), the word cannot in this context mean that the play had never before been performed. Instead it may mean that the play had undergone some kind of revision.

28th January 1594 — *Titus Andronicus* is performed for the second time by Sussex's Men at the Rose.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.77–79.

3rd February 1594 — The theatres are closed once again due to the plague, and stay closed until 1st April.

* Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.67. The closure of the theatres may explain the Stationers' Register entry of *Titus Andronicus*, Arber 2, p.304b / 644, three days later on 6th February.

6th February 1594 — *Titus Andronicus* is entered in the Stationers' Register to John Danter, who prints Q1 in the same year.

* Arber 2, p.304b / 644, and facsimiles in SS DL, p.124 and SS R&I, p.209.

§ The title page of *Titus Andronicus* (1594, Q1) lists Strange's Men, Pembroke's Men, and Sussex's Men as performers of the play.[1] All of these performances were probably before the Stationers' Register entry on 6th February 1594. Sussex's Men, listed last on the title page, certainly performed it as what Henslowe calls a "ne" play (meaning "new" play, in some respect) on 23rd January 1594, and again five days later on 28th January at the Rose.[2] Since this is immediately prior to the Stationers' Register entry, it may be that Sussex's Men were responsible in some way for the publication. It has been suggested that the order of the troupes on the title page is in order of original performance production, a case partly bolstered by the addition of the Lord Chamberlain's Men to the end of the list in a later edition.[3] If this is correct, then the performances in early 1594 by Sussex's Men at the Rose probably cover in full the association with Sussex's Men, especially since the play was listed by Henslowe as new for them.

The association of Pembroke's Men with *Titus Andronicus* classes that play with the troupe in a similar manner to the *Taming of the Shrew* and *1* and *2 Contention*. The first and last of these are said on their title pages to have been performed by Pembroke's Men, and there is also a suspicion therefore that *1 Contention* was performed by that company as well.[4] It is not clear whether Pembroke's Men had the good quarto text of *Titus Andronicus* (1594, Q1) which was printed on the basis of the Stationers' Register entry,[5] and which may have come from Sussex's Men, or whether they had their own different version. The text of *Shrew* (1594, Q1) is a pastiche adaptation, and the texts of *1* (1594, Q1) and *2 Contention* (1595, O1) are probably reported texts of earlier versions of those plays as they appear in the First Folio.[6] Because they were likely performed by Pembroke's Men, it is probable that these were the texts in the repertory

of Pembroke's Men, and it is therefore plausible that their text of *Titus Andronicus* was also adapted, reported, or similarly divergent; that it was therefore not the same text as that which came to be printed from the Stationers' Register entry. The printer of *Titus Andronicus* (1594, Q1), John Danter, did not print any of the other three play texts associated with Pembroke's Men. *Shrew* and 2 *Contention* were printed by Peter Short, and 1 *Contention* was printed by Thomas Creed. Both 1 and 2 *Contention* were, however, sold by Thomas Millington, who was one of the two sellers of *Titus Andronicus* along with Edward White.

[1] Anon [Peele, George and Shakespeare, William] (1594). The most lamentable Romaine tragedie of Titus Andronicus. EEBO, STC 22328. [2] Cf. 23rd January 1594 and 28th January 1594. [3] EKC F&P1, p.61, "The title-page of *Titus Andronicus* suggests that it was played successively by Alleyn's company, Pembroke's, and Sussex's". Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.75, "Most scholars interpret the list of companies on the title-page as a catalog of successive companies that performed the play, beginning with Strange's, then Pembroke's, followed by Sussex's. A later edition of the play adds the Lord Chamberlain's to the list, bolstering the argument". On p.110 Schoone-Jongen says that "*Titus*'s title page, however, establishes Sussex's performed it only after Strange's and Pembroke's had played it." This is very likely based on the external evidence, but from the evidence of the title page itself could only be called indicative. On p.141 the ordering argument is "almost certain" on the basis of the Lord Chamberlain's Men addition. [4] EKC F&P1, p.54 says "Presumably *1 Contention* (1594) had a similar origin." Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.120, "As *True Tragedy* is the sequel to *The First Part of the Contention* (the two were later published together as *The Whole Contention*), it is almost certain *Contention* also belongs to Pembroke's repertory, although its title-page makes no company ascription." There are also passages in *Taming of a Shrew* Q1 that parallel *1 Contention* Q1, according to Shakespeare, William (1998d). The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto. Miller, Stephen Roy (ed.), Cambridge. p.40. [5] Arber 2, p.304b / 644, "vj^{to} die ffebruarij./. John Danter./. Entred for his Copye vnder thandes of bothe the wardens a booke intituled a Noble Roman Historye of Tytus Andronicus. vj^{d}. John Danter./. Entred also vnto him by warraunt from Master Woodcock the ballad thereof, vj^{d}.". Danter printed the 1594 Q1. [6] Schoone-Jongen is extremely cautious about this; the Oxford editors of *1* and *2 Contention* less so. The Oxford position is reasonable despite the lack of caution.

§ Pembroke's Men had come back to London from a disastrous tour of the provinces in mid to late August 1593, with no money and in such dire straits that Henslowe marvelled that they did not pawn their apparel.[1] They are not mentioned thereafter for a few years.[2] The publication of the texts which they are said, on the title pages, to have performed may be connected with their financial situation,[3] but it is peculiar that these texts should have been registered so long after their return to London. A

text of Marlowe's *Edward II* performed by Pembroke's Men was entered on 6th July 1593, just before their return, but this probably had more to do with Marlowe's recent murder than the company's financial problems,[4] otherwise they would have put the other texts up for sale then too. Instead, *1 Contention* (Q1) was entered on 12th March 1594, over six months later; the *Taming of the Shrew* (Q1) was entered on 2nd May 1594; and *2 Contention* (O1) has no Stationers' Register entry but was printed with 1595 on the title page.[5] Why wait so long before selling more texts? Perhaps they had tried to continue performing, and only sold their plays upon realising that conditions were not improving. Or perhaps the texts came to publication for reasons other than wanting to raise capital.

Where did Pembroke's Men get so many Shakespearean plays? The answer is not clear, but the fact that they were able to do so may explain why they rose so swiftly to popularity in 1592. They had played at court in the 1592–93 season, having not been mentioned beforehand, which is a swift rise to eminence. They toured the provinces in 1593, but this resulted in their downcast return to London as soon as August 1593. Why would a company who rose swiftly to eminence fall so quickly too? Characterising Pembroke's Men as having an annus mirabilis in 1592 may be stretching the evidence, and such rhetoric obviously invites wild speculation concerning Shakespeare and whether he was the cause of their short success. But the peculiarities remain insoluble. How did they come by so many Shakespearean texts? And why are those texts adapted and divergent?

It may be that however Pembroke's Men came by the Shakespearean texts, the same source of those texts deserted them in 1593. Shakespeare himself was not necessarily the keeper of the texts. The divergent nature of the texts that were eventually published as having been performed by Pembroke's Men may, however, represent only what they were able to scrape together after Shakespeare's authorial texts left the troupe. That Pembroke's Men obtained the texts and then lost them in 1593 is nonetheless a tenuous scenario because it depends on many factors. Not least amongst these factors is the debate surrounding the divergent Pembroke's Men texts, about which there is still uncertainty. But it does help to consider the potential scenarios for when Pembroke's Men are likely to have performed *Titus Andronicus*. If Shakespeare

wrote for them, which is a possibility, then they could have received at least some of the plays when he completed them. But if they inherited the texts in another way then they probably did so as a unit, receiving all of the texts from one source. The last of the plays to be written which is said to have been performed by Pembroke's Men is 2 *Contention* which was probably completed in late 1591. Pembroke's Men presumably became popular in 1592 for them to have been performing at court in late 1592. All of this points to their obtaining the texts in early 1592, which may mean that their performances of *Titus Androncius* date to 1592 as well.

[1] Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.77, a letter from Henslowe to Edward Alleyn, "& as for my lorde a penbrockes which you desier to knowe wheare they be they are all at home an hauffe ben this v or sixe weackes for they cane not saue ther carges with trauell as I heare & weare fayne to pane thr parell for ther carge & when I wasse in smythfell a sellyng of your horsse I meate with owld" — sadly the following lines are missing and the letter resumes in a different context, so we do not get to know who the old person at Smithfell was whom he met presumably in connection with Pembroke's Men. [2] Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.120. The following excerpt from a footnote by Schoone-Jongen is especially pertinent: "1593–94 Bewdley records include a Pembroke's visit; this could have come after September 1593, but also could have been part of the 1592–93 tour". [3] EKC F&P1, p.55, "The ruin of the Queen's and Pembroke's may have led to the dispersal of their repertories in bulk or of the shares of disbanded individuals." [4] Marlowe was murdered on 30th May 1593, and the Stationers' Register entry for *Edward II* is dated 6th July 1593 according to Arber 2, p.299b / 634. Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.143 says that Marlowe wrote *Edward II* for Pembroke's Men. [5] Shakespeare, William (1998d). The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto. Miller, Stephen Roy (ed.), Cambridge. p.34, and p.40 for *Shrew*.

§ When was *Titus Andronicus* performed by Strange's Men? They did not perform it in 1592. Their performances in that year are recorded from 19th February to 22nd June, after which they went on tour, and *Titus Andronicus* does not appear amongst that recorded repertoire, though *1st Henry VI* most likely does.[1] When they came back from their provincial tour, they started playing at the Rose again from 29th December 1592 to 1st February 1593. In this winter season they played substantially the same plays as they had been performing earlier in 1592.[2] If those plays were deserving of continued performances, there is no reason to believe that they would have started performing *Titus Andronicus* in the provinces and yet then stopped those performances in London. It is almost certain, therefore, that they did not perform *Titus Andronicus* in 1592, and that they also did not perform it before 1st February 1593 after which they went on tour

again.[3] *Titus Andronicus* was entered in the Stationers' Register on 6th February 1594, and in that period of a year from 1st February 1593 till the Stationers' Register entry they could have performed *Titus Andronicus*. But the play is quite likely alluded to in *A Knack to Know a Knave*, which was performed by Strange's Men in their run at the Rose between 19th February and 22nd June 1592.[4] Therefore the play would predate that run. If the title page is complete in its association of the play with Strange's Men, Pembroke's Men, and Sussex's Men, and if Strange's Men were the first to perform it as seems most likely, then they would have been the first to receive the play after it was written. This means Shakespeare would have written the play with George Peele for Strange's Men before 1592, which, if this evidence is correct, provides the most reasonable association between Shakespeare and a company prior to the Lord Chamberlain's Men. This does not necessarily mean that Shakespeare wrote all, or even any other, of his early plays for Strange's Men.

Since Strange's Men were still performing plays at the end of 1592 that they had been performing at the beginning of the 1592, and since at the beginning of the year they were performing a range of old plays,[5] there are two possibilities for why they did not perform Shakespeare and Peele's *Titus Andronicus* in early and late 1592. Either the play was extremely old and out of fashion and performances of it wouldn't sell by now, which would probably push those first performances back into at least 1590, or the company had lost the text, and could not perform it. Since *Titus Andronicus* seems to have been popular with the public, making very respectable earnings when performed by Sussex's Men in January 1594,[6] and having been reprinted in 1600 and 1611,[7] the former argument probably does not hold. That argument is further diminished too by the fact that Pembroke's Men most likely performed the play in 1592. Since that is their most likely year of performance; since that is the year when we have accounts for Strange's Men and would expect to see it in their repertory which contained other old plays; and yet since the title page says anyway that it had at some point been performed by Strange's Men, this implies that Strange's Men lost the text to Pembroke's Men. There is evidence that the companies did not always own their plays, as Henslowe for example seems to have owned Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* which was performed by people who came to the Rose.[8] But *Titus Andronicus* was

played at Henslowe's Rose in early 1594, and yet not in early 1592 and early 1593, so it seems that neither Henslowe nor Strange's Men owned it in those years.

[1] Cf. 19th February 1592. [2] Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.68 says that they performed twelve different plays, and that only two of these were new. [3] Cf. 1st February 1593. [4] Cf. c.1590, entry concerning *Titus Andronicus*, and Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. pp.19–20 for the performances of *A Knack to Know a Knave* by Strange's Men. [5] Such as Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, though this play could have been *John of Bordeaux*, and Henslowe just calls it "Friar Bacon". *A Looking Glass for London* is another play performed that seems to antedate 1592 by at least a year and probably more. [6] According to Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. pp.20–1 it brought in £3 8s, the highest amount after the first three opening plays of their appearance at the Rose. [7] STC 22329, and STC 22330. [8] Gurr, Andrew (2004b). The Great Divide of 1594. In: Boyd, Brian (ed.). Words That Count: Essays on Early Modern Authorship in Honor of MacDonald P. Jackson. p.37.

§ A degree of alliance with some company or companies other than Strange's Men may suggest why the only Shakespeare play that Strange's Men performed in 1592 was probably *1st Henry VI*, a play that Shakespeare only contributed a small portion to; and why, moreover, they did not perform *Richard III* which was probably written quite soon after 2 *Contention* which had been completed in about late 1591. This would also explain why Strange's Men did not appear to perform 2 *Contention* in 1592 either, despite possible references in the text to actors who were probably with them in about 1591;[1] those actors may have gone to Pembroke's Men.

If all this is so, why did Pembroke's Men not sell the text of *Richard III* along with their other texts? Again, the circumstances surrounding their publication and especially the reasons for their textual conditions are unclear. But because the texts were sold sporadically and in their divergent conditions, they do not seem to represent authorial output, and so they may simply have had no text of *Richard III* to sell. They may have owned and performed *Richard III* in 1592, but then lost the text to another owner before their financial problems in 1593. This may even have caused their financial problems. This scenario may also apply to the other Shakespeare play of this period that Pembroke's Men are not known to have performed, the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Shakespeare seems to have been more interested in lyric poetry in 1593 and 1594 anyway, and his only play whose text survives from those two years is *Love's Labour's Lost* which probably dates to the former of the two years. Why and for which company he

wrote that play is of course unknown, and it has even been speculated that it was written for the Southamption circle rather than the theatre companies.[2]

[1] Hotly debated, summarised in Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.141. [2] Wilson, Ian (1993). Shakespeare: The Evidence. p.163, "All the indications are, then, that *Love's Labour's Lost* was written for the private enjoyment of the Southampton circle sometime around the winter of 1593." If Shakespeare left Pembroke's Men in early 1593, he may not have rejoined Strange's Men; he may not therefore have been associated with any company for much of 1593 and 1594. The Lord Chamberlain's Men formed in around mid 1594.

12th March 1594 — *The First Part of the Contention*, an adaptation or bad quarto of *1 Contention*, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.305b / 646, and SS R&I, p.209.

1st April 1594 — The theatres reopen, having been closed since 3rd February.

* Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.83, and cf. 3rd February 1594.

16th April 1594 — The Earl of Derby, patron of Derby's Men who were formerly known as Lord Strange's Men, dies.

* Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.67 & p.106.

2nd May 1594 — *The Taming of a Shrew*, probably an edited version of Shakespeare's *The Shrew*, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.306b / 648, and SS R&I, p.209.

9th May 1594 — *The Rape of Lucrece* is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.306b / 648, and facsimiles in SS DL, p.132 and SS R&I, p.210. If the argument that *Venus and Adonis* was written not long before publication holds, then the same argument probably applies to *The Rape of Lucrece* too.

16th May 1594 — The Countess of Derby's company of players, possibly the leftovers of Strange's Men, play at Winchester.

* Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.217, citing Gurr.

22nd May 1594 — *A Winter's Night's Pastime*, which may bear some relation to the Shakespearean canon, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.307b / 650.

§ We know of three performances of *The Winter's Tale* in the first few years after it was written:[1]

(1) 15th May 1611, Simon Forman sees "the Winters Talle" at The Globe.
(2) 5th November 1611, the King's Men performed "y^{e} winters nightes Tayle".
(3) Winter 1612–13, the King's Men performed "The Winters Tale".

Because no copy of the work survives, it is not certain that it was a play, but the word "Pastime" may indicate this.[2] The work was entered by Edward White, who only entered four plays or possible plays before 1600:[3]

3rd April 1592 — *Arden of Feversham*
20th November 1592 — *Soliman and Perseda*
14th May 1594 — *John of Gaunt*
22nd May 1594 — *A Winter's Night's Pastime*

Surveying the possible attributions of the works entered in 1592, Chambers mentions scholars' suggestions of Kyd, a Kyd imitator, and Kyd and Marlowe for *Arden of Feversham*; and Kyd, Peele, and Greene and Kyd for *Soliman and Perseda*.[4] These plays are both therefore in the vein of Kyd, and may share the same author. If so, perhaps this is a small indication that the works entered in 1594 also share the same author with one another, if not also with the 1592 works. The 1594 works do share one characteristic: they are both lost, and as a result it is impossible to say whether either were really plays. In fact, Chambers says that *John of Gaunt* was probably "not a play but the chap-book source of that begun by Hathway (q.v.) and Rankins for the Admiral's in 1601", though he then goes on to point out that Arber, who prepared the Stationers' Register transcripts, describes it as a play.[5]

If the two batches of entries, the 1592 and 1594 entries, are some indication that each batch had the same author and that they were the same kind of work, then the use of "Pastime" in the title of the latter 1594 work, coupled with the strange possible echo of it in the records of the performance of the King's Men play on 5th November 1611, makes it plausible that both of these works were plays. If they were both plays by the same author, then unless *John of Gaunt* is some hitherto entirely unknown play by Shakespeare, it is unlikely that *A Winter's Night's Pastime* was an early version of *The Winter's Tale* by Shakespeare himself. This certainly does not rule it out of being the source of Shakespeare's play by some other author, a practice which Shakespeare seems to have followed in the case of other plays including *King John*, *Hamlet*, and *King Lear*.

[1] Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. p.1967, EKC ES 4, p.177, and EKC ES 4, p.180 respectively. [2] An example use from the period is Eliot, John (1593). Ortho-epia Gallica. EEBO, STC 7574. p.50 who mentions "All maner of pastime, as to see Comedies, and Tragedies, to leape, to danse, fencing, beare-bayting, shooting, running, shooting in the peece, walking abroad in the fieldes, rowing in boates on the water." This refers to the seeing of plays as a pastime, and not the play itself. [3] EKC ES 4, pp.380–6. [4] EKC ES 4, pp.3–4 and EKC ES 4, pp.46–7 respectively. [5] EKC ES 4, p.401.

3rd June 1594 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men are mentioned by Philip Henslowe in the earliest known reference to the troupe under that name.

[*] Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.83 and Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.39.

9th June 1594 — The ur-*Hamlet* is played by the combined Lord Chamberlain's Men and Admiral's Men at Newington Butts.

[*] Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.82–4.

11th June 1594 — Henslowe, possibly writing 11th in error for 13th, records a performance of *The Taming of the Shrew*.

[*] Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). Henslowe's Diary. pp.21–2.

25th June 1594 — Richard Field transfers registration of *Venus and Adonis* to John Harrison in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.310 / 655, and SS R&I, p.210.

20th July 1594 — *The Tragedy of Locrine*, which would be printed as newly "set foorth, overseene and corrected" by "W.S.", is entered into the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.310b / 656, and SS R&I, p.210. *Locrine* has strong parallels with another play, *Selimus*, but the connection between the two is uncertain; cf. Greg, W. W. (ed.) (1908). Collections, Part II. Malone Society Collections, 1.2. pp.108–9, and McMillin, Scott and MacLean, Sally-Beth (1998). The Queen's Men and their Plays. p.92. Vitkus, Daniel J. (2000). Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England. p.17 summarises some evidence that Greene wrote at least part of *Selimus*.

3rd September 1594 — *Willobie his Avisa*, an apparent roman à clef which alludes to Shakespeare, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 2, p.312 / 659.

§ *Willobie his Avisa* is a poem published under the name of Henry Willoughby, a student at Oxford, who according to a preface signed "Hadrian Dorrell" had gone abroad. Dorrell says that he found the poem amongst the papers of his friend Willoughby, and is publishing it without his friend's consent. The Oxford records show no Hadrian Dorrell, but do show a Henry Willoughby.[1] The person signing himself Dorrell writes that "I haue baptised it by the name of *Willoby his Auisa*: because I suppose it was his doing, being written with his owne hand. How he will like my bouldnes, both in the publishing, and naming of it, I know not." Dorrell signs and dates the preface from his "chamber in Oxford this first of October", though the year is left out.[2]

Shakespeare is mentioned directly by name, for the first time ever in print in someone else's work,[3] in the second stanza of a poem prefacing the work, signed "Contraria Contrarijs: Vigilantius: Dormitanus."[4] The stanza refers to the recently published *Rape of Lucrece*: "And *Shake-speare*, paints poore *Lucrece* rape".[5]

[1] All from SS CDL, p.181. [2] Quotes from Willoughby, Henry (1594). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25755. To the gentle & courteous Reader. [3] It is the first in both EKC Allusions, pp.1–8 and EKC

F&P2, pp.186–237. [4] Cf. EKC F&P2, p.192, and the notes therein. [5] Willoughby, Henry (1594). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25755.

§ The work is about a lady called Avisa whose father, according to Canto 1, is "the Maior of the towne" located on the "wester side of Albions Ile". In Canto 2 Avisa is courted by a nobleman, but she eventually marries someone of her own social standing. In Canto 14, after her marriage, she is tempted by "Ruffians, Roysters, young Gentlemen, and lustie Captaines, which all shee quickly cuts off". At Canto 44 and onwards the author himself apparently writes himself into the tale as yet another unsuccessful suitor. The poem then reaches its pinnacle, and the author concludes by praising the constancy of the maid he sought to woo: "Eternall then let be the fame / Of such as hold a constant mind".[1]

[1] Willoughby, Henry (1594). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25755.

§ The passage which has attracted the most attention from scholars of Shakespeare is the large prose introduction to Canto 44 (out of 74), titled "*Henrico Willobego. Italo-Hispalensis.*" This is apparently an allusion to the author, and the first time that this character is mentioned in the work. Canto 68 is the only other canto to have a large prose introduction; the entire rest of the work is written in ABABCC hexameter.

The Canto 44 introduction describes how "H.W.", i.e. Henrico, falls in love at first sight with Avisa, and tells his "familiar frend W.S." about the situation. He does so because W.S. had recently "tryed the curtesy of the like passion", falling in love with either Avisa or someone else, and was now cured. Continuing the medical metaphor, Henrico says that rather than rushing to his aid to staunch the wound, however, W.S. simply lets Henrico bleed. Musing on why W.S. should do so, Henrico says it is "eyther for that he now would secretly laugh" at poor Henrico; that he had "giuen occasion not long before vnto others to laugh at his owne", and thus was dragging Henrico through the same humiliation as him; or "because he would see whether an other could play his part better then himselfe, & in vewing a far off the course of this louing Comedy, he determined to see whether it would sort to a happier end for this new actor, then it did for the old player."[1] The use of the theatrical metaphor, coupled with the reference in the preface, has brought about a now common suspicion that

"W.S." refers to Shakespeare.[2] In the conclusion of the prose introduction, Henrico's loving comedy turns to tragedy when he realises that his task to woo Avisa is an impossibility; but over time he gradually recovers.

[1] Quotes from Willoughby, Henry (1594). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25755. Canto 44. [2] See, e.g., SS CDL, p.181.

§ What exactly is going on in *Willobie his Avisa*? As Schoenbaum says, on the face of it this "curious work seems to have something to do with the *Sonnets*".[1] The suggestion is that the love triangle in Canto 44 between W.S., Henrico, and Avisa parallels similar situations in the *Sonnets*. One can, according to Schoenbaum, easily see the temptation to regard H.W. as some sort of an esoteric pun, referring ostensibly to Henry Willoughby, but covertly to Henry Wriothesley, "the proposed Fair Youth of the *Sonnets*."[2] On the other hand, the "invincible chastity of Avisa doubtfully qualifies her for the part of the promiscuous temptress of the *Sonnets*."[3] The problem with using *Avisa* as a key to the *Sonnets* is that the former is just as tantalising yet ultimately mysterious as the latter; they are both locks, and both without a key. It is not even certain that that "W.S." refers to Shakespeare, though the contemporary offence that the work caused (q.v. 30th June 1596) does support this conclusion.

[1] SS CDL, p.180. [2] SS CDL, p.181. [3] SS CDL, p.182.

22nd September 1594 — There is a large fire in Stratford.

* Mutschmannm, Heinrich and Wentersdorf, Karl P. (1952). Shakespeare and Catholicism. p.63, and Fripp M&A1, p.401.

8th October 1594 — The Lord Chamberlain asks the Lord Mayor of London to let his troupe play at the Cross Keys Inn in Gracechurch Street.

* Shakespeare, William (2002c). King Richard II. Forker, Charles R. (ed.), Arden. p.120.

28th October 1594 — Alexander Aspinall marries Anne Shaw, his second wife, and Shakespeare may have written a poem for the occasion.

* Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1907). Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries. p.248.

§ Aspinall was the schoolmaster in Stratford from 1582 to his death in 1624,[1] and Anne Shaw was the widow of Rafe Shaw, an inventory of whose goods John Shakespeare had taken in August 1592 (q.v.).[2] Sir Francis Fane of Bulbeck compiled a miscellany dated 1629 which includes a poem about Aspinall, with an attribution to Shakespeare added by a scribe:[3]

> The gift is small
> The will is all:
> A shey ander Asbenall.
> Shaxpaire vpon a peaire of gloues that maser sent to his mistris.[4]

According to Fripp, a pair of gloves was a "customary gift" for a groom to give his bride. He concludes therefore that this miscellany poem was written for the occasion of Aspinall and Shaw's marriage, and that as a Shaw family friend and premier glover, John provided the gloves.[5] Eccles calls the wedding suggestion a "pleasant fancy" stated as fact, and Schoenbaum apparently follows him in saying that the suggestion is made "with more sentimental fancy than plausibility".[6] An argument on internal evidence from the turn of the millennium does, however, support it to some extent.[7]

[1] Eccles, p.57. Honigmann, E. A. J. (1998). Shakespeare: The Lost Years. p.131, who gives the same information, notes that Aspinall was one of the four Lancashire schoolmasters, out of five, from 1569 to 1624. [2] Fripp M&A1, pp.401–2. [3] Foster, Donald W. (1999). "The gift is small, / The will is all". In: Halio, Jay L., et al. (eds.). Shakespeare: Text and Theater. p.93. [4] Eccles, p.57, who has "mas[t]er". [5] Fripp M&A1, pp.401–2. Fripp does not note any links between Sir Francis Fane and Shakespeare. [6] Eccles, p.57 and SS CDL, p.67. [7] Foster, Donald W. (1999). "The gift is small, / The will is all". In: Halio, Jay L., et al. (eds.). Shakespeare: Text and Theater. p.93, regarding the shey or Shaw pun.

§ Wells and Taylor suggest that the strange spelling of Alexander is either a corruption of the mediaeval spellings Alesaunder or Alisaunder, which were still occasionally in use, or possibly an inside joke. Donald Foster may have deciphered the joke. He believes that "A shey ander Asbenall" would, in pun-diluting modern orthography, read "A-Shaw-under Aspenall". Shaw, the surname of the bride, could be pronounced "shey", and has been incorporated into the forename of the groom.[1] Fripp transcribed "A shey ander" as "Asheyander", a rendering which is contradicted by Eccles and Foster.[2] The use of "ander" as "under" may pertain to an inscription of the

wedding couple's names, their relative social statuses, innuendo, or some combination thereof, etc.

That the poem should be transmitted with its pun form intact, if the pun is intended in the way that Foster believes, may indicate that the poem has been transmitted with an explanation of its context, since the context is not obvious from the poem; one would have to know that Shaw is the name of the bride for the pun to make sense. The pun is the best evidence that the poem relates to the marriage.

[1] Foster, Donald W. (1999). "The gift is small, / The will is all". In: Halio, Jay L., et al. (eds.). Shakespeare: Text and Theater. p.93. [2] Fripp M&A1, pp.401–2, citing f.177 of the miscellany.

§ Other literary evidence regarding the poem is scant. Wells and Taylor note the resemblance to "Yet my good will is great, though the gift small" in *Pericles* (Act 1.4, 17), and state that the pun on "Will" would "be characteristic of Shakespeare",[1] perhaps with Sonnets 135 and 136 foremost in mind. The resemblance to the line in *Pericles* may however be rendered irrelevant by the fact that acts one and two of that play are thought to have been written by a collaborator, probably George Wilkins.[2] Donald Foster and Duncan-Jones & Woudhuysen note several poesies and other contemporary texts which express a similar sentiment, and characterise the poem as too conventional to determine authorship with confidence.[3]

[1] Wells, Stanley, and Taylor, Gary (1997). William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion. p.455. [2] Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.83. Cf. c.1607, the writing of *Pericles*. [3] Foster, Donald W. (1999). "The gift is small, / The will is all". In: Halio, Jay L., et al. (eds.). Shakespeare: Text and Theater. p.93, and Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems. p.436.

§ The phrase "vpon a peaire of gloves" from the scribe's comment may mean that the poem was written on occasion of the gloves, that it was embroidered into the gloves themselves, or both. Considering the attribution in light of Fripp's explanation of wedding gifts, the gloves were apparently "sent" from Alexander to Anne, though this is a strangely impersonal choice of verb.

The most reasonable explanation for the circumstances are that Shakespeare wrote the poem *for* Alexander, but addressed *to* Anne on her groom's behalf. Yet if this is the case, the personal pun on "will" may be considered somewhat out of place; perhaps this is simply not a pun after all. The particulars of the situation cannot be discerned for sure, but given the poem's strong link to the occasion, it does not in general seem to belong to the Shakespeare mythos. There is no strong evidence that Shakespeare was the author, but nor is there evidence to refute this.

3rd November 1594 — The Lord Mayor asks the Privy Council for suppression of plays at the Swan theatre and other locations.

* Montrose, Louis Adrian (1996). The Purpose of Playing. p.49. Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.85–7 contains a transcript.

26th December 1594 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play in front of the Queen.

* EKC F&P2, p.319.

27th December 1594 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men probably play again in front of the Queen.

* EKC F&P2, p.319. The entry is given as 28th December, which Chambers explains is probably in error. Cf. c.1594, the writing of the *Comedy of Errors*.

28th December 1594 — *The Comedy of Errors* is played in a famous performance at Gray's Inn, on an evening which became known as The Night of Errors.

* EKC F&P2, pp.319–20.

30th December 1594 — A mock trial is held to attempt to find the source of the confusion on The Night of Errors.

* Sohmer, Steve (1999). Shakespeare's Mystery Play. p.217.

1595

1595 — W.C., thought to be William Covell, mentions Shakespeare, Thomas Nashe, and other contemporaries, in a printed marginal note to his *Polimanteia*.

* EKC F&P2, p.193.

1595 — George Carey, son of the patron of Shakespeare's company, is nominated to the Order of the Garter though not selected, and Shakespeare may have prepared for possible selection by writing the short fairy masque that would later be used in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*.

* Cf. 1597 — the writing of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. The use of this theme for the masque may have inspired the fairy themes in *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

c.1595 — *Romeo and Juliet* is written.

§ Shakespeare based several aspects of the combat scenes in *Romeo and Juliet*, and perhaps Friar Lawrence's soliloquy on plants, on a fencing manual by Vincentio Saviolo published in 1595.[1] The work was dedicated to the Earl of Essex, and Saviolo beseeches Essex "to accept this Booke, howsouer it be, as a new yeeres gifte proceeding from a mind most dutifully affected towards you".[2] The Elizabethan court was using Lady Day, 25th March, as the New Year,[3] but Saviolo was Italian and perhaps still using continental conventions, where New Year's Day was celebrated on 1st January. The use of "1595" on the title page does not necessarily imply that it was printed after 25th March because printers commonly started to use the next year early on title pages to make their works look more current.[4] It is also not clear whether or not Saviolo intended to present the printed form to Essex, and if he did then the book must have gone to print before New Year's Day. Saviolo's work is divided into two parts, and since the second part is dated 1594 rather than 1595 on the inside title page, this latter section was probably written first, and then the former section completed just in time for the giving of a New Year's gift, just before either 1st January 1595 or 25th March 1595. An alternative scenario is that the printer, John Wolfe, dated the inside title page with a more accurate date. Either way, allowing

some time for dissemination and reading, and assuming that Shakespeare did not have access to a manuscript copy, then *Romeo and Juliet* was probably not underway any earlier than February 1595.[5]

[1] Holmer, Joan Ozark (1994). "Draw, if you be Men": Saviolo's Significance for Romeo and Juliet. Shakespeare Quarterly, 45.2, Summer. pp.163–189, referring to Saviolo, Vincentio (1595). Vincentio Saviolo his Practice. EEBO, STC 21788. [2] Saviolo, Vincentio (1595). Vincentio Saviolo his Practice. EEBO, STC 21788. Sigs. A3V–A4r. [3] Sohmer, Steve (1999). Shakespeare's Mystery Play. pp.20–23 records that Elizabeth struggled to keep the Julian calendar with the old New Year's Day. [4] Dobranski, Stephen B. (2005). Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England. p.158. [5] This contradicts Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.369, who thought a 1594 date possible; they suggest "1594 or 1595".

§ The first quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* was printed by John Danter and Edward Allde in 1597, though there is not sufficient evidence to tell at what time of the year the printing started. There is no Stationers' Register entry for Q1, so the date is derived solely from the title page, which also declares the play to have been "often (with great applause) plaid publiquely, by the right Honourable the L. of *Hunsdon* his Seruants."[1] The patron of Shakespeare's company was only styled the Lord Hunsdon between 22nd July 1596 and 17th April 1597,[2] so the reference, whether grounded in the name of the company when the quarto was printed or the name of the company when the performances took place, must have been in that range.[3]

[1] Shakespeare, William (2007b). The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet. Erne, Lukas (ed.), Cambridge. p.37. [2] Fleay, Frederick (1876). Shakespeare Manual. p.33. [3] It is not clear whether or not the Lord Chamberlain's Men, as they were styled after 17th April 1597 upon George Lord Hunsdon becoming Lord Chamberlain, would be referred to as the Lord Chamberlain's Men proleptically for performances prior to the new style, but it seems unlikely. It might be seen as a slight to refer to the Lord Chamberlain by his old title, even though that was his title for those performances: those servants, that troupe, would now be the Lord Chamberlain's servants, and since this was the same continuous company then it may have made more sense to always use the current title.

§ Since *Romeo and Juliet* is based on Saviolo's work, it must have been written after February 1595, and since the title page of Q1 declares it to have been played by the Lord Hunsdon's servants, it must have been written before April 1597. There are two obvious ways to narrow the range of probability further. The first is to observe that Shakespeare is more likely to have responded to Saviolo's work closer to the time of

publication, when it was news and being talked about, to capitalise on any popularity. The second and rather more tentative method is to analyse the relationship between this and other similar plays by Shakespeare, to gauge their most likely relative chronology on internal evidence.

Romeo and Juliet is often classed along with *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Richard II* as lyrical plays. The lyric similarity between R&J and *Dream* is, however, stronger than between those two plays and R2. The similarity that R2 has with the other two is mainly one of being written in a high percentage of verse, and apart from some scenes of great metatropical lyricism such as the king landing at Barkloughly castle, little else from this family of style is shared. R&J and *Dream* on the other hand share specific subjects, such as the Queen Mab monologue by Mercutio and the fairy world of *Dream*, and the masque at the end of *Dream* as a microcosm of the R&J plot. The Queen Mab monologue would seem more logically to prefigure *Dream*, and there is structural evidence that the *Dream* masque reflects on an already completed R&J.[1]

The evidence for both *Dream* and R2 place them in 1595. A poem by Samuel Daniel, probably used as a source for R2, was still popular in literary conversation in November 1595. Though it is not clear whether Daniel's poem was published before or after Saviolo's book, the indications are that it came out later since it was still a hot topic so late in the year, and since Saviolo's book was clearly early, being probably printed between January and March or so. It is also unknown how long it took for Saviolo's book to become popular enough for Shakespeare to write a play so focussed on combat of this kind. Since R&J and *Dream* bear more affinity with one another than either of those to R2, and since *Dream* dates most plausibly to the middle of 1595, it seems most likely that the three plays were written in the sequence R&J, *Dream*, and R2.

[1] Cf. c.1595, the writing of a *Midsummer Night's Dream*, especially the section referenced to suggestions on the subject by Shakespeare, William (2003a). A Midsummer Night's Dream. Foakes, R. A. (ed.), Cambridge. p.2.

c.1595 — *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is written.

§ On 30th August 1594, at the celebrations of the baptism of Prince Henry of Scotland, a triumphal chariot was to be brought in bearing confections, dames, and allegorical figures. The chariot was drawn by a "blackamoor", but as the description from 1603 notes, the original choice was a real lion.[1] Malone connected this event to the lion and the ladies in Act 1.2, 3.1, and 5.1 of a *Midsummer Night's Dream*. The report of the celebrations is not known to have been published in London before 1603, and since the 1603 edition was published simultaneously in Edinburgh and London,[2] an earlier London edition is unlikely. But news of the events could have circulated by other means. Comparing the festivities to similar events of the period, Rick Bowers concludes that this baptism was particularly lavish, and was an important political statement.[3] The Earl of Sussex attended as English ambassador; Chapman dedicates his *Seven Books* of the Iliad (1598) to him.[4]

[1] Anon (1603b). A Trve Report of the Most Tryumphant, and Royall Accomplishment of the Baptisme of the Most Excellent, Right High, and Mightie Prince, Henry Fredericke. EEBO, STC 11214.8. Sig. D1r. "As it was solemnized the 30. day of August 1594." EEBO attributes the text to William Fowler, but this attribution does not appear in the work; their cue was probably that in the text one William Fowler is said to have prepared the entertainments. [2] Bowers, Rick (2005). James VI, Prince Henry, and A True Reportarie of Baptism at Stirling 1594. Renaissance and Reformation, 29.4. p.3. [3] Bowers, Rick (2005). James VI, Prince Henry, and A True Reportarie of Baptism at Stirling 1594. Renaissance and Reformation, 29.4. pp.5–6. On p.15 Bowers thinks that the connection to the lion in a *Midsummer Night's Dream* is coincidental, but also makes the observation that the published account of the lion, presumably referring to the 1603 pamphlet, "accomplished fuller effect than any literal appearance could have done." [4] Chapman, George (1598). Seauen Bookes of the Iliades of Homere. EEBO, STC 13632. Sig. A3r.

§ In 1595, Edmund Spenser's *Amoretti and Epithalamion* were published.[1] Sonnet 71 of *Amoretti* contains a reference to "woodbynd flowers and fragrant Eglantine" which may be echoed by Shakespeare in his "Quite ouercanopi'd with lushious woodbine, / With sweete muske roses, and with Eglantine" from Act 2.1 of a *Midsummer Night's Dream*.[2] The wordplay on "fair" in Sonnet 79 of *Amoretti* may, moreover, be echoed by Helena in Act 1.1.[3] *Amoretti and Epithalamion* were entered in the Stationers' Register on 19th November 1594,[4] and the work was probably printed not long thereafter.[5] As printers had a habit towards the end of a year of using the succeeding year to make their works seem more up to date,[6] the work may have been printed before the Elizabethan new year, 25th March 1595.

[1] Spenser, Edmund (1595). Amoretti and Epithalamion. EEBO, STC 23076. [2] Spenser, Edmund (1595). Amoretti and Epithalamion. EEBO, STC 23076. Sonnet LXXI; and Shakespeare, William (1600a). A Midsommer Nights Dreame. British Library, STC 22302. Sig. C2v, BL C.34.k.29. [3] Both resemblances noted by Shakespeare, William (1979). A Midsummer Night's Dream. Brooks, Harold F. (ed.), Arden. p.xxxv–xxxvi. [4] Arber 2, p.315 / 665. [5] Shakespeare, William (1979). A Midsummer Night's Dream. Brooks, Harold F. (ed.), Arden. p.xxxv. [6] Dobranski, Stephen B. (2005). Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England. p.158.

§ Prior to 10th January 1595, a woman known as Judith Phillips, Dorothy Phillips, or Doll Phillips had tried to cozen a sixty year old widowed tripe-wife named Mrs. Mescall. The cozening was an elaborate plot where Mrs. Mescall was coerced to marry a new suitor who was actually in confederacy with Phillips. On 10th January depositions were taken of Phillips and her confederates, and the crime became public knowledge. Three works on the subject were entered in the Stationers' Register on 25th February 1595,[1] but none of these survive.[2] A pamphlet by a writer who dates his work at the end to "this 2. of Aprill. 1595" does,[3] however, survive, and it describes what occurred. One of the pranks committed on the old lady concerns a stool:

"Now you that be louers tell mee whether it were a hot signe of loue or no, when the Widdowe (sitting asleepe by the fire) he valiantly (comming behinde her) pulled her stoole from her, when downe fell she, and he by or vpon her, with that learned and wittie aduerbe in his mouth, *Keepe the widdow waking*."[4]

Which is perhaps the source of Puck's prank in Act 2.1 of a *Midsummer Night's Dream*:

The wisest Aunt, telling the saddest tale,
Sometime, for three foote stoole, mistaketh mee:
Then slippe I from her bumme, downe topples she,
And tailour cryes, and falles into a coffe;[5]

Dr. Johnson says the "custom of crying *tailor* at a sudden fall backwards, I think I remember to have observed."[6] A more recent suggestion is that the woman would have fallen on the floor cross-legged, the same position that a tailor sits in when

sewing.[7] If neither of these possible explanations are to be admitted, then the oddness of the exclamation may be explained as a specific reference. The man to whom the widow was supposed to be wed was called Peters, and he was a grocer.[8] Another of the confederates was named Vaughan, but his profession is not given; perhaps he was a tailor?

The fact that the crime was under judicial consideration in January, in print around February, and still being referred to in a new pamphlet in April, not to mention the plurality of works and ballads on the subject, shows that it was a subject of not inconsiderable gossip and had some durability as news. This makes it more likely that Shakespeare would have referred to it in a play that would take months to write and stage.

[1] Arber 2, p.318b / 672. [2] All from Harrison, G. B. (1930). Keep the Widow Waking. Library, Series 4, 9.1. p.98. On p.101, Harrison notes the connection to a *Midsummer Night's Dream*. Also noted in Shakespeare, William (1979). A Midsummer Night's Dream. Brooks, Harold F. (ed.), Arden. p.xl. [3] Anon (1595). A Quest of Enquirie. EEBO, STC 18758. p.22. The text is pseudonymously attributed to one "Oliver Oat-meale", but the epistle to Oatmeal is signed "D.D." [4] Anon (1595). A Quest of Enquirie. EEBO, STC 18758. p.14. [5] Shakespeare, William (1600a). A Midsommer Nights Dreame. British Library, STC 22302. Sig. C2v, BL C.34.k.29. [6] Malone, Edmond (1821). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Boswell Jr., James (ed.). Vol. 5. p.208. [7] Greenblatt, Stephen, et al. (eds.) (2008). The Norton Shakespeare. p.857. [8] Harrison, G. B. (1930). Keep the Widow Waking. Library, Series 4, 9.1. p.100.

§ The Pyramus and Thisbe interlude performed in Act 5 of a *Midsummer Night's Dream* is from Ovid. The source does not, however, say anything about the parents of Pyramus and Thisbe being opposed to their love, as suggested not only in Act 5, but also by the presence of the parents in the sequence where Quince casts the play in Act 1.2. This suggests that Shakespeare was thinking of the opposition to the love between members of the houses of Montague and Capulet in *Romeo and Juliet*, further suggesting that that play was written first.[1] Brooks and Holland state that the weight of consensus is that *Romeo and Juliet* was the first of the two plays to be written, but Holland also makes some arguments suggesting the opposite.[2]

If the majority argument holds, then the dating of *Romeo and Juliet* also becomes pertinent for dating a *Midsummer Night's Dream*. There is no clear latest bound for *Romeo and Juliet*, but the earliest bound is the printing of Saviolo's fencing manual, which was presented to Essex as a New Year's gift for 1595 (whether Old Style or New Style is not known), and bears 1595 on the title page. It must therefore have been printed after December 1594 at least, and giving three months for the writing of *Romeo and Juliet* would place a *Midsummer Night's Dream* no earlier than April 1595. As one of Shakespeare's shortest plays a *Midsummer Night's Dream* may have taken only two thirds as long to write compared to an average sized Shakespearean play, if composition periods are proportionate based on length.

[1] All as suggested by Shakespeare, William (2003a). A Midsummer Night's Dream. Foakes, R. A. (ed.), Cambridge. p.2. [2] Shakespeare, William (1979). A Midsummer Night's Dream. Brooks, Harold F. (ed.), Arden. p.xliii, and Shakespeare, William (2008a). A Midsummer Night's Dream. Holland, Peter (ed.), Oxford. p.110.

§ In terms of indications, the Stirling lion event places a *Midsummer Night's Dream* after August 1594, and the possible echoes of *Amoretti* to some point after early 1595, New Style. The otherwise tentative possible reference to the stool jest is a little stronger in this light, and grounds the play after February to April 1595.[1] The play probably comes after *Romeo and Juliet* which is in turn based on a work from early 1595. The events of a *Midsummer Night's Dream* are set in May, but the name of the play is a *midsummer* night's dream, referring to St. John's Night of 23rd June. Perhaps this reflects the circumstances of the play's composition. Shakespeare may have started in late April or early May, and finished just before midsummer.

[1] This contradicts Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.401, who thought that *A Midsummer Night's Dream* may have been written "in 1594 or 1595". The earlier of the two years is made unlikely by the available evidence.

c.1595 — *Richard II* is written.

[*] Cf. following commentary. All evidence is congruent with the suggestion in Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.339 that *Richard II* "was probably written no earlier than 1595".

§ There are three major points on which the dating of *Richard II* can be predicated. The first is of an edition of a book by Samuel Daniel which contains material very similar to passages in Shakespeare's play, and the question of the relationship between the two works. The second is the mention by Sir Edward Hoby of a possible early performance. The third is the relationship to other Shakespearean plays thought of be of a similar date. These points in combination most strongly indicate a 1595 date, though if they are interpreted with the utmost skepticism the play may be found to date approximately a year either side of this date.

§ Samuel Daniel wrote an historical poem on the Wars of the Roses entitled *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, which was entered in the Stationers' Register on 11th October 1594.[1] The title page bears the date 1595, and since the work was described as being of current interest in a letter of 3rd November 1595, there is reason to believe that it was printed towards the middle of that year.[2] Charles Knight was the first to point out the close resemblances between Daniel and Shakespeare in his *Pictorial Edition* of the latter in 1839.[3] He expresses surprise that neither Malone nor the other commentators had found the resemblance earlier. The parallels he finds range from the mild to the moderately convincing, but were bolstered by the discovery of a stronger parallel in the 20th century by George M. Logan that he had missed. One of Shakespeare's major sources was Holinshed,[4] so Knight gives examples where Shakespeare used material from Daniel which was not present in Holinshed, such as the scene where Richard II lands at Barkloughly, probably modern day Harlech:

In this year, in a manner throughout all the realm of
England, old bay-trees withered, and afterwards, contrary
to all men's thinking, grew green again, a strange sight,
and supposed to import some unknown event.

(Holinshed)

Red fiery dragons in the air do fly,
And burning meteors, pointed streaming lights,
Bright stars in midst of day appear in sky.

(Daniel)

The bay-trees in our country are all wither'd,
And meteors fright the fixed stars of heaven;
The pale-fac'd moon looks bloody on the earth.

(Shakespeare)

Twentieth century discussion of the specific parallels found by Knight is extremely limited, even though many works state that Shakespeare followed Daniel. In 1976, George M. Logan found the new evidence that Shakespeare had borrowed from Daniel which strengthened Knight's case.[5] He found that Daniel had used Lucan as a model for the opening of his poem, and Shakespeare parallels Daniel's use of Lucan rather than of Lucan himself.

Some scholars have doubted that Shakespeare used Daniel, and suggested instead that Daniel was the borrower, for example Hudson in 1852, and Lambrechts in 1967.[6] The opinion of Knight who discovered the parallels was that Shakespeare was the borrower. Shakespeare had borrowed from Daniel on at least one other occasion around the period of writing *Richard II*, when he used Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamond* for his *Lucrece*.[7] There was also a possible two way borrowing between Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* and Daniel's two versions of *Cleopatra*.[8] More recently than Lambrechts, Andrew Gurr says that study of the links between borrowed passages "confirms the view that Shakespeare borrowed from Daniel rather than the other way about."[9]

It is not known for sure that Shakespeare did not see Daniel's work in manuscript, which would make an earlier date for *Richard II* possible. It must however be at least more likely that Shakespeare did not use Daniel until the publication of the work in approximately mid 1595. Indeed the publication of Daniel's poem may have inspired Shakespeare as to the subject for his next play. This sets the most plausible earliest date of writing for *Richard II* to mid 1595.

[1] Arber 2, p.313 / 661. [2] Shakespeare, William (2003g). Richard II. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.1. [3] Knight, Charles (1839). The Routledge Pictorial Edition of the Works of W. Shakespeare. Vol. 1,

Histories. p.83. [4] Shakespeare, William (2003g). Richard II. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.194. [5] Logan, M. George (1976). Lucan-Daniel-Shakespeare: New Light on the Relation between The Civil Wars and Richard II. Shakespeare Studies, Vol. 9. pp.121–40. [6] Hudson, Henry Norman (1852). The Works of Shakespeare. Vol. 5. pp.6–7 and Lambrechts, Guy (1967). Sur Deux Prétendues Sources de Richard II. Etudes Anglaises, Vol. 20. pp.118–39. [7] Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. p.1814. [8] Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. p.1391. [9] Shakespeare, William (2003g). Richard II. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.1.

§ Sir Edward Hoby wrote to Sir Robert Cecil on 7th December 1595 inviting Cecil to his house in Canon Row on Tuesday 9th December, where "as late as it shal please you a gate for your supper shal be open: & K. Richard present him self to your veve."[1] Hoby does not say which of the three King Richards of England he means. There are many possible interpretations of what he may have meant in general, one of which is that this was a private performance of Shakespeare's *Richard II*. In support of this view, the Lord Chamberlain, patron of the company of which Shakespeare was a part, was Hoby's father-in-law and a good friend of his.[2] That Richard is said to "present him selfe" to Cecil's view indicates a performance, where an actor playing a part is able to present himself, unless this was a particularly unconventional metaphor for a portrait or a book. Against this view, I. A. Shapiro points out that Cecil was told he could arrive at any time, and that Shakespeare's *Richard III* would naturally be assumed as the Richard play, if it were a play, since only it would not need to be disambiguated until *Richard II* was written.[3] There are several reasons why Hoby may not have specified the individual king, however, such as already having discussed the play or a possible portrait with Cecil. Hoby was known to have commissioned a portrait series just a couple of years previously, which was to include Richard II and Richard III, raising the possibility that he was referring to a newly completed portrait in this series.[4]

Though Cecil could arrive at any time, the players would be in the general employ of the Lord Chamberlain, and could be asked by the Lord Chamberlain to be available, especially for an important statesman such as Cecil.[5] The numbering argument is also weak, and though the matter of the portrait commission is more plausible, it is made partly questionable by the "present him selfe" metaphor. Hoby could be praising the fidelity of such a portrait, saying that it was painted with such quality that Cecil will think that King Richard (whichever one) was there to present himself. On these bases,

the theory that Hoby was referring to a Lord Chamberlain's Men performance of Shakespeare's *Richard II* is the most likely, but not probable, scenario. The portrait scenario is not as plausible. The proximity to the Samuel Daniel textual parallels means that this documentary datum provides a moderate indication of the play's completion by this date.

[1] Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. p.1963. EKC F&P2, p.321 gives "him selfe" rather than "him self". [2] Shakespeare, William (2003g). Richard II. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.56 and Shakespeare, William (1955). The Life and Death of King Richard II. Black, Matthew W. (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 27. p.576. [3] Shapiro, I. A. (1958). Richard II or Richard III or...? Shakespeare Quarterly, 9.2. p.205. [4] Shakespeare, William (2003g). Richard II. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.56. [5] The same company, as the King's Men, were also to be at the king's general disposal. Cf. 7th August 1606 and EKC F&P2, p.333 especially for the wording.

c.1595 — Richard Carew refers to "Shakespheare and Barlows fragment", apparently referring to works such as *Venus and Adonis* and Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*.

[*] The work was not printed until 1614, as a new section in Camden, William (1614). Remaines Concerning Britaine. EEBO, STC 4522. p.44. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.27. *Hero and Leander* is called a "fragment" by Edmund Bolton in his *Hypercritica* of c.1621, a work which also mentions Shakespeare. (EKC Allusions, p.213 tentatively gives the date as 1610. In a more recent appraisal, however, Blackburn, Thomas H. (1966). The Date and Evolution of Edmund Bolton's "Hypercritica". Studies in Philology, 63.2. pp.196–202 gives the date of the majority of the work as 1621.)

6th January 1595 — Gray's Inn had put on a masque between 12th December and this date with a mock embassy of Muscovites accompanied by "Negro Tartars", which may be paralleled in *Love's Labour's Lost*.

[*] Raffield, Paul (2004). Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England. p.111.

15th March 1595 — Kemp, Shakespeare, and Burbage of the Lord Chamberlain's Men were paid for the performances given in front of the Queen on or around the 26th and 28th December 1594 at Greenwich Palace.

[*] Facsimile of the payment in SS DL, p.136. Cf. Cook, David (ed.) (1961). Collections, Volume VI. Malone Society Collections, Vol. 6. p.29 and EKC ES 4, pp.164–5.

§ This is the first time that Shakespeare is mentioned in direct connection with the Lord Chamberlain's Men; it is not clear when he joined.[1] There are only four different years in his career as a playwright where, according to the present chronology, he wrote three plays. One is 1590, the second and third are 1595 and 1596, and the fourth is 1599. It may not be coincidence that these were all very important years for Shakespeare. 1590 was his first year as a playwright. 1595 and 1596 were his first two full Old Style years with the Lord Chamberlain's Men. 1599 was the year when the Globe theatre opened. Shakespeare may have naturally increased his literary output when occasions demanded it. If this is the case, and if the chronology of his works is accurately represented, then this may be an indication that he joined closer to the March 1595 payment date than in early to mid 1594. Since he was receiving payment for the Christmas period plays, however, it would seem likely that he was involved in those plays, and that therefore he joined the company before the end of New Style 1594.

[1] Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.39, the "Lord Chamberlain's Men formed by 3 June 1594; Shakespeare may already have been in the company at that time, although he is not definitely connected with it until he appears as a court payee for Chamberlain's performances on 26 and 28 December 1594".

25th August 1595 — M^{r} Shakespeare, either John or William, buys a book from Joan Perrott in Stratford.

§ The book bought by John or William had belonged to Margery Young, the sister of the printer Richard Field, widowed in March. She had sold it to Joan Perrott on the 20th July, along with many other more valuable goods for a price far lower than they were actually worth. Perrott then sold them at a huge profit. Young claimed later that she had been deceived by Perrott during the original sale, and in October a jury agreed with her and awarded her £5 9s 4d. The case continued under appeal. Memoranda surrounding the appeal from around October 1596 record M^{r} Shakespeare's purchase of the book,[1] and note that M^{r} Barber of the Bear inn bought a prayer-book. Since the book that M^{r} Shakespeare bought is not described in the same way, it was evidently not a prayer-book.[2]

[1] Fripp, Edgar Innes (1924). Master Richard Quyny. p.94 cites "Misc. Doc. vii. 244", referring to archival material in the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Records Office. There is an important difference between M[r] and Mr, the former being pronounced Master and being a term of more prestige than Mr or Mister. [2] These facts are distilled from Fripp, Edgar Innes (1924). Master Richard Quyny. pp.92–5.

§ The book purchase by M[r] Shakespeare is not widely known; aside from Edgar Innes Fripp, Schoenbaum and Germaine Greer mention it.[1] The comparative lack of attention to the purchase is surprising because, as Fripp points out, whichever way the evidence is interpreted there are important ramifications: "If Master Shakespeare was John, the old Alderman, the purchase is evidence (if we need it) that he was not illiterate; if William, the son, it is evidence of the Poet's presence in Stratford about 25 August 1595."[2] Little is known about the literary capabilities of Shakespeare's family, with the exception of Dr. John Hall, and about the balance of Shakespeare's time spent in London and Stratford, so this event is a helpful indicator.

[1] SS CDL, p.38, and Greer, Germaine (2007). Shakespeare's Wife. p.180. [2] Fripp, Edgar Innes (1924). Master Richard Quyny. p.95.

September 1595 — There is a large fire in Stratford.

* Fripp M&A1, p.419.

13th September 1595 — The Lord Mayor once again sends a letter to the Privy Council trying to limit the showing of plays.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.94.

1st December 1595 — *Edward III*, a play by Shakespeare and probably a collaborator, possibly Thomas Kyd, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.6 / 55. Cf. 1590, the entry regarding *Edward III*, and Slater, Eliot (1988). The Problem of the Reign of King Edward III. p.104 (work conducted in 1981).

7th December 1595 — Sir Edward Hoby sends a letter to Sir Robert Cecil inviting him to what may have been a performance of *Richard II*.

§ Sir Edward Hoby was son-in-law to Henry Carey,[1] the then Lord Chamberlain and patron of Shakespeare's company. Cecil was chief advisor to the Queen, a very important man at court. Hoby writes to Cecil that "I am bold to send to knowe whether Teusdaie may be anie more in your grace to visit poore Channon rowe where as late as it shal please you a gate for your supper shal be open: & K. Richard present him selfe to your vewe".[2] The reference to King Richard may refer to a play, to be held at Hoby's house which was in Canon Row.[3] The play involving a King Richard which would have been the most fashionable at the time is the recently completed *Richard II*, to be played by the company belonging to Hoby's father-in-law.[4] The Tuesday coming was the 9th December. There is no known record as to whether Cecil attended or not.

[1] Knafla, Louis A. (2004). Hoby, Sir Edward (1560–1617). In: The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. p.437. [2] EKC F&P2, pp.320–1. [3] EKC F&P2, p.320. [4] Cf. the entry c.1595 on the writing of *Richard II* for more details and discussion of this event.

1596

9th December 1596 — Sir Robert Cecil may have attended a performance of *Richard II* at the home of Sir Edward Hoby.

* EKC F&P2, pp.320–1, and Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. p.1963.

1596 — According to Malone, Shakespeare may have been living near the Bear-Garden in Southwark.

* Malone, Edmond (1796). An Inquiry into the Authenticity of Certain Miscellaneous Papers and Legal Instruments. p.215. Malone takes this information from a paper which he states "formerly belonged to Edward Alleyn, the player".

c.1596 — *King John* is written.

§ *King John* was not the only Elizabethan play produced on the reign of that king. There had been an earlier play called *The Troublesome Raigne of John King of England* which was printed in two parts for Sampson Clarke in 1591.[1] This first edition was not attributed to any author, but the second edition of the *Troublesome Raigne* printed by Valentine Simmes in 1611 attributed it to "W. Sh",[2] and then the third edition printed by Thomas Dewe in 1622 attributed it explicitly to Shakespeare.[3] In fact this play was attributed unequivocally by Charles R. Forker in 2011 to George Peele,[4] with whom Shakespeare had been working on *Titus Andronicus* in c.1590,[5] just one year before the *Troublesome Raigne* was published. The theme, setting, and vocabulary and metrical characteristics of *King John* are most closely related, amongst the rest of the Shakespearean canon, to *Richard II* which was written in 1595; and in vocabulary and metrical characteristics is also closely related to the *Merchant of Venice*,[6] written in 1596. It seems therefore that Shakespeare returned to the theme of what is probably Peele's play over five years after he and Peele had been collaborating on a different play, *Titus Andronicus*. This opens the question of whether Shakespeare may have contributed in some way to the *Troublesome Raigne* too.

Guy Hamel thinks that the "originality of *The Troublesome Raigne* is such that, despite the banalities and gross inadequacies of the play, it is difficult not to suspect that Shakespeare had a hand in it, at least in the plotting. No other of the possible candidates seems nearly so likely."[7] It is quite possible that the later writing of *King John* explains why Simmes and Dewe attributed the *Troublesome Raigne* to Shakespeare, not to mention the fact that Shakespeare's popularity probably helped to sell books. But it may also be the case that the title page attribution has at least some slim factual basis, if Shakespeare had a hand in the plotting as Hamel contends. Braunmuller thinks that this argument is grounded in Bardolatry, the idea that "Shakespeare was a master of both plotting and dramatic language; he did not need and would not use, even as a guide, another writer's arrangement of an action; any author who seems his peer or superior must some way owe that quality to Shakespeare."[8] In comparison with Holinshed's treatment of King John, it is clear however that there are strong parallels in the dramatisation of the reign between the *Troublesome Raigne* and *King John*.[9]

[1] Vickers, Brian (2004). The Troublesome Raigne, George Peele, and the Date of King John. In: Boyd, Brian (ed.). Words That Count: Essays on Early Modern Authorship in Honor of MacDonald P. Jackson. p.78. Anon (1591). Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England. EEBO, STC 14644 for one of the parts. [2] Sh., W. [Anon] (1611). The first and second part of the troublesome raigne of Iohn King of England. EEBO, STC 14646. Probably a false attribution, and more likely by George Peele. [3] Shakespeare, William [Anon] (1622). The first and second part of the troublesome raigne of Iohn King of England. EEBO, STC 14647. Probably a false attribution, and more likely by George Peele. [4] Shakespeare, William (2011c). The Troublesome Reign of John, King of England. Forker, Charles R. (ed.), Revels Plays. [5] Q.v. c.1590, the writing of *Titus Andronicus*. [6] Shakespeare, William (2008g). King John. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.3. Cf. the earlier Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.425, who state that "probably Shakespeare wrote his play in 1595 or 1596". [7] Hamel, Guy (1989). King John and The Troublesome Raigne: A Reexamination. In: Curren-Aquino, Deborah T. (ed.). King John: New Perspectives. p.43. [8] Shakespeare, William (2008g). King John. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.12. [9] Shakespeare, William (2008g). King John. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.17–18.

§ Questioning whether Peele was capable of producing the dramatised plot, or whether Shakespeare was content to use Peele's dramatised plot wholesale, has not stimulated useful enquiry on the origins of the plays. But there are other factors that may be used to tease out the nature of the connection. Terence Schoone-Jongen for example notes evidence that Shakespeare's "friends and literary executors", as he

characterises those involved in the production of the First Folio, "regarded *King John* as the same play as *Troublesome Reign*."[1]

Brian Boyd points out that involvement by Shakespeare may explain "why the play distorts history to refocus John's reign so intently on the killing of Arthur in a fashion quite at odds with Peele's anti-Catholic purpose".[2] We could also ask why Shakespeare keeps the dramatised plot of the old play but so thoroughly transforms the content; though one could perhaps ask the same question of *Hamlet*. On balance it is probably more likely than not that Shakespeare was involved in some way with the *Troublesome Raigne*, and that he was most likely involved with plotting. It is possible to predicate this only on the following facts: that Shakespeare worked with Peele in the period; that the killing of Arthur is at odds with the anti-Catholic purposes of Peele; and possibly that Shakespeare left the plot relatively intact in his own version, in comparison with Holinshed.

[1] Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). Shakespeare's Companies. p.99. It is not certain that no edition of *King John* existed prior to the First Folio, as one may be missing or lost; nor is it certain that the publishers who dealt with the entries would have checked attributions of previously published plays with as high a degree of thoroughness as Shakespeare's colleagues curating his legacy. But the point is indicative nonetheless. [2] Boyd, Brian (2004). Words That Count: Introduction. In: Boyd, Brian (ed.). Words That Count: Essays on Early Modern Authorship in Honor of MacDonald P. Jackson. p.20.

c.1596 — *The Merchant of Venice* is written.

§ In June 1596 the Earl of Essex captured a ship which he renamed the *Andrew*, and this probably explains the reference to a ship of the same name by Salarino in Act 1.1.[1] The news about this ship reached England on 30th July 1596,[2] which places the *Merchant of Venice* after that date. The first quarto of the play was entered in the Stationers' Register on 22nd July 1598,[3] and was mentioned by Francis Meres in his *Palladis Tamia* entered in the Stationers' Register on 7th September 1598.[4] Generally, the period between writing a play and it being entered in the Stationers' Register exceeds 18 months.[5] This would push the original composition of the play to between August 1596 and February 1597. Since Shakespeare was writing *1 Henry IV* between August 1596 and 5th March 1597, and since it seems reasonable to infer that *2 Henry IV* and the *Merry Wives of Windsor* were composed immediately thereafter, it is most likely that

the *Merchant of Venice* was written in the start of this period, starting not long after news of the *Andrew* reached England at the end of July 1596.[6]

[1] Shakespeare, William (2008o). The Merchant of Venice. Halio, Jay L. (ed.), Oxford. p.27. [2] Janik, Vicki K. (2003). The Merchant of Venice: a Guide to the Play. p.2. [3] Arber 3, p.39b / 122. [4] Q.v. 7th September 1598. [5] This is an approximate figure derived in Dusinberre, Juliet (2004). Pancakes and a Date for As You Like It. Shakespeare Quarterly, 54.4. p.372 from the data in Erne, Lukas (2002). Shakespeare and the Publication of His Plays. Shakespeare Quarterly, 53.1. pp.10–12. [6] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.453 date the play less specifically to "1596 or 1597".

c.1596 — *1 Henry IV* is written.

§ In the original *1 Henry IV*, Sir John Falstaff had the surname Oldcastle, which offended an aristocratic family forcing Shakespeare to change the name. The only candidate found for causing such a change to be made is William Brooke, Lord Cobham, who was the Lord Chamberlain from August 1596 to 5th March 1597.[1] The play could only therefore have been written in or before this period. It was entered into the Stationers' Register on 25th February 1598.[2] Using the 18 month guideline for the average period between writing and entry into the Stationers' Register would place *1 Henry IV* in August 1596,[3] but this is only an approximate figure. On the other hand the news of the ship *Andrew*, which constitutes evidence to date *Merchant of Venice* after 30th July 1596,[4] was a topical event, and as such would be most prudently added to a play as soon as possible, when the news was still topical. If *1 Henry IV* was being written or started after news of the *Andrew* were known, why wait until an entirely new play, the *Merchant of Venice*, before mentioning it? Therefore it seems more likely that *1 Henry IV* was written after the *Merchant of Venice*, in the autumn or winter of 1596. That it reached the Stationers' Register for publication quicker than average may reflect its popularity.

[1] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.481, who date the play to "1596 or 1597" on that basis, and Shakespeare, William (2007a). The First Part of King Henry IV. Weil, Herbert, and Weil, Judith (eds.), Cambridge. p.5. [2] Arber 3, p.31 / 105, cf. EKC F&P1, p.375. Q.v. 25th February 1598. [3] This is an approximate figure derived in Dusinberre, Juliet (2004). Pancakes and a Date for As You Like It. Shakespeare Quarterly, 54.4. p.372 from the data in Erne, Lukas (2002). Shakespeare and the

Publication of His Plays. Shakespeare Quarterly, 53.1. pp.10–12. [4] Cf. c.1596, the writing of the *Merchant of Venice*.

c.1st January 1596 — Jacques Petit saw *Titus Andronicus* performed by a London troupe at a country house of Sir John Harington in Burley-on-the-Hill in Rutland.

§ The letter is from the correspondance of Anthony Bacon, secretary of the Earl of Essex, addressed to him from his servant Jacques Petit. Petit writes, "Le Jour de lan fut monstree la liberalité de ces bon[s gens] & principalem[t] de Mad: la Contesse [Russell] car depuis le plus [grand] iusques au plus petit elle en donna bon tesmoignage, mesm[e] i'en puis dire quelque chose. Les commediens de Londres son[t] venus icy po[r] en auoir leur pt. on les feit iour le soir [de] leur venue & le lendemain on les despecha / On a fait icy vne mascarade de linuention de Sir Edw: wingfild on a aussi ioué la tragedie de Titus Andronicus mais la monstre a plus valeu q̄ le suiect."[1]

[1] Ungerer, Gustav (1961). An Unrecorded Elizabethan Performance of Titus Andronicus. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 14. p.102. Sir Edward Wingfield also wrote a masque for the festivities.

4th Feburary 1596 — James Burbage buys the Blackfriars, and converts it into a playhouse which would later be used by Shakespeare's company.

* EKC ES 2, p.503 and Wickham, Glynne (1972). Early English Stages, 1300 to 1660. Vol. 2. p.130.

21st May 1596 — William Gardiner, a Justice of the Peace, later alleges that Francis Langley, owner of the Swan theatre, slandered him in public in Croydon on this day, in a case which was to involve Shakespeare.

* Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.323. Cf. 29th November 1596 for more extended discussion.

25th June 1596 — John Harrison transfers registration of *Venus and Adonis* to William Leake in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.11 / 65, and SS R&I, p.210.

30th June 1596 — An author using the possible pseudonym "Hadrian Dorrell" issues an apology concerning a possible allusion to Shakespeare.

* Willoughby, Henry (1605). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25756. The Apologie. Dorrell himself dates the apology.

§ Whatever the cause, the publication of *Willobie his Avisa*, registered on 3rd September 1594 (q.v.) and with a possible allusion to Shakespeare, had certainly caused offence. According to Henry David Gray the 1599 edition was "called in by the authorities, and this may also have happened to the 1596 edition of which there are no copies extant; and this means that somebody of considerable importance was offended."[1] Despite the censorship, the book was printed again not just in 1599 but 1605 and 1609 as well. The offence is nonetheless reflected in the debate that issued from the presses after the first edition.

In 1596 a book by Peter Colse called *Penelope's Complaint* was published, a broad imitation of *Avisa*. Colse says that *Avisa* was "by an vnknowen Authour", and confesses that his work is an imitation of it. Despite this, he is critical of the original.[2] This criticism was then answered directly in a 1596 edition of *Avisa*, surviving in the 1605 edition, wherein Hadrian Dorrell issues a long Apology and refutation of something that seems to go far beyond Colse's published criticism.[3] Dorrell states that there was never any real woman referred to by the Avisa, and gives a somewhat cryptic admonition to those who would practice the art of putting names to initials:

"These fancies (forsooth) haue framed names to letters, of their own deuises; and they haue imagined places of their owne placing, so fitly for euerie description, that they will needs inforce the Author to speak of them, whome hee neuer knew; to ayme at their fancies, whose faces hee neuer saw; and to Cypher their names, whose natures to him were ignorant and strange."

Whoever Hadrian Dorrell was, he had reversed his position, perhaps to stave off the criticism which would soon turn to censorship despite his Apology. Yet in a strange closing gambit to his Apology, he also squarely blames the injuries that have been felt (by whom he does not say) on Colse: "And also, vnder fained letters, generally

expresseth, what course mose of these lawlesse suters take, in pursuit of their fancied fooleries, and therefore this P. C. hath offred manifest iniurie to some, whateuer they bee, whome his priuate fancie hath secretly framed in conceit."[4]

[1] Gray, Henry David (1941a). Shakespeare, Southampton and Avisa. Stanford Studies in Language and Literature. p.146. [2] Colse, Peter (1596). Penelope's Complaint. EEBO, STC 5582. To the Readers. [3] Though the 1596 edition is not available, the 1605 version is, and contains the apology dated again by Hadrian Dorrell to "30th June 1596". Willoughby, Henry (1605). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25756. The Apologie. [4] Quotes from Willoughby, Henry (1605). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25756. The Apologie. "P. C." very likely refers to Peter Colse.

§ On the issue of authorship of the *Avisa*, Dorrell claimed of Colse, who said that the work was anonymous, that "The Author was vnknown, not because hee could not; but because hee woulde not know him: his true name beeing open in euery Page."[1] Would that this were found to be the case! Gray goes so far as to suggest that this is "all a most obvious hoax for stirring up interest by a pretended fight: Willobie is himself Peter Colse."[2] Peter Colse does seem to be as much a pseudonym as Hadrian Dorrell: at least, no contemporary references to them outside of these works come to attention.

The 1605 edition of *Avisa* contains apologetic verses signed "Thomas Willoby *Frater* Henrici Willoby *nuper defuncti*", i.e. Thomas Willoughby, brother of Henry Willoughby, lately deceased.[3] These verses, placed after Dorrell's Apology, were probably at the end of the 1596 edition too, because Dorrell's apology claims that Willoughby was "now of late gone to God". Henry did have a younger brother called Thomas.[4] If Henry had not recently died, would it have been easy for Dorrell and the apparent Thomas Willoughby to make such a claim? This is what they would have had to pass off if Dorrell is just a pseudonym for Henry. Yet the story in the original preface does seem very far fetched.

[1] Willoughby, Henry (1605). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25756. The Apologie. [2] Gray, Henry David (1941a). Shakespeare, Southampton and Avisa. Stanford Studies in Language and Literature. p.147. [3] Willoughby, Henry (1605). Willobie his Avisa. EEBO, STC 25756. [4] Hotson, Leslie (1938). I, William Shakespeare. pp.57–8.

§ There is a possible documented connection between Shakespeare and Henry Willoughby. The two overseers of Shakespeare's will were Shakespeare's lawyer, Francis Collins, and a man named Thomas Russell.[1] Russell was married to Katherine Bampfield, whose sister had married William Willoughby, Henry Willoughby's older brother. Leslie Hotson points out evidence that the Russell and Willoughby families were reasonably acquainted.[2] So the alleged author of *Avisa* was the brother-in-law of the sister-in-law of an overseer of Shakespeare's will.[3]

[1] Hotson, Leslie (1938). I, William Shakespeare. p.15. [2] All from Hotson, Leslie (1938). I, William Shakespeare. p.59. [3] According to Hotson, Leslie (1938). I, William Shakespeare. p.112–40, Thomas Russell also married, as his second wife, the mother of Leonard Digges, who later eulogised Shakespeare.

22nd July 1596 — The Privy Council close the theatres due to the plague.

* EKC ES 4, p.319, mentioned in Burkhart, Robert E. (1975). Shakespeare's Bad Quartos. p.66.

23rd July 1596 — The Lord Chamberlain and 1st Baron Hunsdon, patron of Shakespeare's company, Henry Carey, had died.

* His monument in Westminster Abbey clearly says "Obit. 23 [July] 1596", but Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.237 and EKC ES 2, p.192 say 22nd July. Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1969). The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's Patron. p.237 says 22nd–23rd July.

11th August 1596 — Hamnet Shakespeare is buried.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register in SS DL, p.164. EKC F&P2, p.4.

12th August 1596 — Henry Carey is buried at Westminster Abbey at the Queen's expense.

* Sohmer, Stephen T. (2007). Shakespeare for the Wiser Sort. p.144. Sohmer says that Carey died on 23rd July.

October 1596 — Shakespeare is assessed as owing 5s. of tax on £5 of goods, in St. Helen's Bishopsgate, London.

* Public Record Office (1964). Shakespeare in the Public Records. p.9. Cf. 15th November 1597 and 1st October 1598.

§ This was the second of three assessments which parliament had granted in 1593, and which Shakespeare was meant to pay by February 1597. Shakespeare had not done so by 15th November 1597 (q.v.) because his name appears on a list of defaulters, which how the assessment is known.[1] St. Helen's Bishopsgate was a tiny parish about 500ft across at its widest, which in modern terms sits nestled between Tower 42 and 30 St Mary Axe ("the Gherkin"), north of the Thames.[2] A 1981 summary of the parish as it was in 1638 attributes to it between 24.3 and 38.7 percent substantial households, which was some measure of poverty in the parish, showing it to be neither prosperous nor a slum.[3]

[1] All from EKC F&P2, p.89. [2] Derived by comparing Edward Stanford Ltd. (1959). City of London. Showing Parish Boundaries Prior to Union of Parishes Act of 1907. Reproduction map against a modern map. [3] Finlay, Roger (1981). Population and metropolis: the demography of London 1580–1650. p.78, via Twigg, Graham (1993). Plague in London. In: Champion, Justin A. I. (ed.). Epidemic Disease in London. No. 1. pp.1–17.

§ The 1597 defaulters in the Bishopsgate ward were affirmed to be "ether dead, dept and gone out of the sayde warde or their goodes soe eloigned or conveyd out of the same or in suche a pryvate or Coverte manner kept" to the effect that the several sums of money they had been assessed as owing could not be collected.[1] Shakespeare was, however, assessed for tax again in the same parish on 1st October 1598 (q.v.) for a subsidy granted by parliament in 1597, so he must have been living in St. Helen's in both periods.

On the one hand, Shakespeare may have moved away from the parish and moved back again, but on the other hand he may have been a continuous resident and have kept his goods in a "pryvate or Coverte manner", managing to evade paying the tax. The former is consistent with Malone's now missing evidence that Shakespeare lived in Southwark near the Bear Garden in 1596 (q.v.), south of the Thames, and the possibility that the surety claimed against Shakespeare and others on 29th November 1596 meant that he was a resident in the vicinity of the Bear Garden. If the latter is the case, however, then the known extents of Shakespeare's residence are set by the

two known assessments, the first of which was for the period 1593–6, and the second for the period 1597–8.

Chambers says in his summary of the situation that Shakespeare had ceased to live in St. Helen's "possibly by the winter of 1596–7",[2] but he does not note that Shakespeare must have come back if so. He notes in his detailed analysis that parliament only granted the subsidy for the second assessment during its 1597–8 sitting,[3] but he does not say what period this subsidy applies to; perhaps it even applied to a period *prior* to the grant? It is not known therefore exactly when or for how long Shakespeare lived in St. Helen's, but he had certainly lived there at some point in this period.

[1] Public Record Office (1964). Shakespeare in the Public Records. p.9. Chambers derived his transcript from an Athenæum article; the P.R.O. transcription is more accurate. [2] EKC F&P2, p.88. [3] EKC F&P2, p.87.

20th October 1596 — John Shakespeare applies for a Coat of Arms, which are granted to him.

§ There are two drafts of the grant in the College of Arms records, both of which are dated 20th October,[1] numbered articles 23 and 24. Chambers says that article 23 is "almost certainly" the earlier of the two,[2] and articles 23 and 24 are therefore referred to henceforth as the first and second drafts respectively. Honan surmises that Shakespeare went to the College of Arms himself to make the application,[3] arguing that the poet was probably on hand to supply the details interlineated into the first draft which were subsequently incorporated into the second draft. The grant in general authorises the use of the arms, and justifies this by giving biographical details about John that support his right to be an armiger.

[1] Facsimiles of the records, articles 23 and 24, in SS DL, pp.168–69. Cf. Art. 23 in HP O2, p.56, identified as art. 23 by EKC F&P2, p.18. Art. 24 in EKC F&P2, p.20. Halliwell-Phillipps notes that the regnal year is wrong in art. 23, but corrected in art. 24. [2] EKC F&P2, p.18. [3] Honan, p.228.

§ The two drafts contain three biographical facts each in their main text. Two of these were already present in the initial version of the first draft, then modified with

interlineations, and the third was entirely interlineated. The second draft appears to simply copy all of the facts given in the first draft, a kind of neat copy to include the interlineations, but it is difficult to be certain about this since the document is damaged and parts are missing. The interlineations are shown by square brackets, and the damage by short ellipses:[1]

1. "whose [parentes & late] antecessors were for theye [their] valieant & faithefull service advaunced & rewarded by the most pruden .. prince King Henry the seventh of famous memorie" (1st), "parentes .. antecessors. [Grandfather] were for theyr [his] faithfull & va .. ed .. Prince king *Henry* the seventhe of ..". (2nd)

2. "sythence whiche tyme they have contiweed [at those partes] in good reputacion and credit" (1st), "continewed [in these partes being] of good reputacion". (2nd)

3. "[John having maryed Mary, daughter & one of the heyres of Robert Arden of Wilm[cote], in the said counte Armig.]" (1st), "*Iohn* hathe maryed the daughter .. Counte gent [esquire]". (2nd)

Of the third fact there is ample evidence (q.v. c.May 1557), but much debate has been generated about the first and second. Chambers gives an excellent summary of the attempts to trace the rewarded ancestor and the lands in question, but does not conclude by finding either, and subsequent research has also failed to locate them.[2]

The frustrated effort may be related to the small possibility that John's father was not Richard Shakespeare. But the second fact indicates that they have continued "at" or "in" those "partes", where parts seems to refer to the lands, though this could refer to the county or general area. Which of the lands that John owned may have been originally those granted by Henry VII to one of his ancestors? Schoenbaum ends up wondering if the whole thing was not just a polite fiction of the heralds.[3]

[1] Quotes from the first draft are transcribed from the facsimile of *College of Arms, MS Vincent 157, art.* 23 in SS DL, p.168. Insertions are given using square interpolation brackets. HP O2, p.56 transcribed "Armig." (for Armiger) in the second quote as "gent." despite the clear capital "A". Quotes from the second draft are from Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd

edition, Vol. 1. p.1954, with conjectural reconstructions changed to short ellipses. [2] SS CDL, p.228 gives no further information, and Greenblatt, Stephen (2004). Will in the World. p.80 says that "no record of this service or its reward has emerged". [3] SS CDL, p.228.

§ At the end of the second draft only, and separate from the main text but apparently in the same hand,[1] there are an additional four biographical facts given. The last of these facts is that John married an heir of Arden, which is already given in the main text. The other three are that (1) he submitted another application for arms 20 years ago, (2) that he has been a chief of the town of Stratford for 15 or 16 years, and (3) that he owns lands, tenements, and wealth of the substance of £500.

Of the first fact, the earlier application, nothing is known except what is written here. The College of Arms could presumably have checked its own records to confirm it, however, so that there was an earlier application seems likely to be correct. The second fact is wrong in dating: John was elected bailiff on 5th September 1571 (q.v.), which was 25 years before this application; he had also been affeeror since 6th October 1559 (q.v.), and had prepared the chamberlains' accounts and been alderman since the mid-1560s. In a parenthetical aside, Schoenbaum wonders if 15 and 16 years, in roman numerals in the original, is "a mistake for xxv and xxvi".[2] But there may be another possibility.

The first note says that "This John shoeth" the pattern of his initial trick of arms under one of the heralds' hand in a 20 year old paper.[3] Might the three facts given underneath this one be, therefore, from that original paper? If the paper was indeed 20 years old, then 15 or 16 years before that would be 1560 or 1561. This is close enough to the affeerorship, chamberlainship, and aldermanship appointments to account for the discrepancy. The 20 year figure may be rough, as Schoenbaum suggests,[4] and would only have to be out by two or three years either side.

Of the third fact, that John's goods and money came to £500, this may be an overstatement given the heavy financial difficulties that John was in during the 1580s, unless he was able to recover or it includes income brought in by his increasingly wealthy son. But it might have been more plausible when John made the original application, and so this supports the idea that the subsequent facts are from that

original. Whilst it is possible that John's net worth was inflated to secure the application, it does seem very peculiar indeed that a *smaller* figure than is really the case is given to support John's active civic service. Why not say that he has been engaged in civic duties for 35 years, rather than 15? Though the twenty year old paper is described as containing a pattern, this does not mean that it was only a pattern—there was a pattern on the two draft grants of 1596 for example. On balance, therefore, it seems most likely that the appended notes were added simply as a note by and for the heralds recording the initial application.

The fact that "John shoeth" the twenty year old application may mean that he was present in London himself, but could also be understood as an action taken place through his son as an agent. The wording "John provideth" may perhaps have been more appropriate in the latter case, but it is risky to base biographical conjecture on the linguistic style of one verb written in a note. John was about 66 years old in 1596 (cf. c.1530), so the trip to London may have been getting uncomfortable for him by then, but it seems unwise to rule out the possibility entirely.

[1] EKC F&P2, p.18. [2] SS CDL, p.228. [3] EKC F&P2, p.20. [4] SS CDL, p.228, "The twenty years alluded to, carrying us back to 1576, may be taken as approximate."

§ The phrase "non sanz droict" (not without right), written several times on the drafts, appears to have been intended as a motto.[1] Perhaps it was chosen for the initial twenty year old application for arms that John had made. The choice of motto was entirely in the hands of the armiger, at any rate, and did not have to be registered with the College of Arms.[2] The phrase is not known to have been ever used with the arms outside of the drafts for the grant.[3]

On the first draft "Non, Sanz Droict." is written above "non, sanz droict:" (crossed out) at the top left of the document. They both appear just above the trick, or the sketch of the arms. "NON SANZ DROICT" is written in much larger script just to the right of the two lines.[4] On the second draft the phrase appears only once: "Non Sanz droict".[5] These various forms of wording have received a lot of attention, and Honan even describes the three phrases on the first draft as a kind of comedy unfolding in the clerk's office, without saying exactly what the joke was.[6] The only characteristic

which consistently changes between them is the capitalisation, which points to a matter regarding rendering and display: they may, for example, have been trying to decide how the motto should appear within the achievement included in the finished grant. If so, this does not explain why the capitalisation is irregular on the second draft.

[1] Acceptance of this point is almost absolute. SS CDL, p.229 for example is barely cautious, and Eccles, p.85 and Honan, p.228 give it as fact. [2] EKC F&P2, p.24 quotes a 1610 work which says that mottos were "the Invention or Conceit of the Bearer", and another from 1896 which says that they may be "changed at pleasure". [3] SS CDL, p.229 says "neither he nor his descendants seem ever to have used it". On the same page Schoenbaum notes that the fair draft has not yet turned up. [4] SS DL, p.168. [5] Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems. p.448. [6] Honan, p.228.

§ Ben Jonson may allude in *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1599) to the Shakespearean motto. In the third act Jonson has an idiot called Sogliardo buy a coat of arms, and the knight Puntarvolo suggests that his motto be "Not without mustard".[1] Jonson is alluding to an incident in Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penniless* (1592), which was apparently first noticed by R. B. McKerrow.[2] In this work a mad ruffian is at sea and caught in a terrific tempest, so he swears that if he makes it through he will never eat haberdine (dried cod) again. When the storm is over, he modifies the vow by appending: "not without Mustard good Lord, not without Mustard".[3] Though taken from Nashe the phrase is not originally a motto, so this does not rule out the possibility that Jonson used it as a jibe at Shakespeare.

James Bednarz thinks that Shakespeare may be jesting back at Jonson in *As You Like It*,[4] which was also written in c.1599 (q.v.). Jonson may be parodied in the form of the certain knight mentioned by Touchstone: "Of a certaine Knight, that swore by his Honour they were good Pan-cakes, and swore by his Honor the Mustard was naught: Now Ile stand to it, the Pancakes were naught, and the Mustard was good, and yet was not the Knight forsworne." Celia and Rosaline ask why, and Touchstone explains: "if you sweare by that that is not, you are not forsworn: no more was this knight swearing by his Honor, for he neuer had anie; or if he had, he had sworne it away, before euer he saw those Pancakes, or that Mustard."[5]

[1] Jonson, Ben (2001). Every Man Out of His Humour. Ostovich, Helen (ed.). p.232. [2] Ingleby, Clement Mansfield (1909). The Shakspere Allusion-book. p.60, antedating Baskervill, Charles Read (1911). English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy. p.210 which is the earliest identification according to Jonson, Ben (2001). Every Man Out of His Humour. Ostovich, Helen (ed.). p.232. [3] Nashe, Thomas (1592). Pierce Penilesse his supplication to the diuell. EEBO, STC 18372. Sig. B.3. [4] Bednarz, James P. (2001). Shakespeare and the Poets' War. p.113. [5] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Comedies. p.187.

November 1596 — Residents of the Liberty of Blackfriars, including Baron Hunsdon the patron of Shakespeare's company, Lady Elizabeth Russell, and Richard Field, petition the Privy Council to prevent James Burbage from allowing the performance of plays in the Blackfriars theatre in their liberty.

* Gurr, Andrew (2004c). The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642. pp.6–8. The petition was upheld. Cf. 13th April 1597 for the expiration of the lease on the Theatre.

3rd November 1596 — Francis Langley, owner of the Swan theatre, craves sureties of the peace against William Gardiner and William Wayte.

* Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.20, also mentioned in Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.523. Cf. 29th November 1596 for more extended discussion.

5th November 1596 — John Shakespeare witnesses a marriage settlement between Robert Fulwood and Elizabeth Hill.

§ According to Halliwell-Phillipps, "a marriage was arranged between Robert Fulwood of Little Alne and Elizabeth, the sister of Richard Hill, rector of Hampton Lucy. This Robert was the grandson of Agnes Arden". Robert was the grandson of Agnes by her first husband, John Hill. The source is the marriage settlement document itself, "which bears the date of October the 10th, 1596". The possibility that the "John Shaxpere", whose name was signed by a scrivener, was not in fact the poet's father is refuted by Halliwell-Phillipps in a detailed argument.[1]

[1] Distilled from HP O2, p.247. Fripp M&A1, p.453 gives the same details, apparently from the same source since his paragraph is similarly structured and he does not give any further details, but he does not give a citation.

§ Though several events of the Shakespeare family take place in the churches and chapels of surrounding parishes—e.g. John and Mary's marriage, probably at Aston Cantlow,[1] William and Anne's marriage, probably at Temple Grafton or Luddington,[2] and Thomas Quiney's penance for fornication at Bishopton[3]— Richard Hill and the church at Hampton Lucy do not appear to feature elsewhere in any significant way. John Shakespeare was represented by a Richard Hill in the lawsuit of 18th January 1587 (q.v.), but no link to the Hampton Lucy rector is suggested.

[1] SS CDL, p.22, where Schoenbaum calls this "Very likely". [2] SS CDL, p.87. Schoenbaum also mentions Bishopton (which he calls a "chapel" on p.294), but concentrates mainly on the evidence for Temple Grafton and Luddington. [3] SS CDL, p.294.

9th November 1596 — George Peele, who wrote *Titus Andronicus* with Shakespeare, is buried.

* Horne, David Hamilton (1952). The Life and Minor Works of George Peele. p.108, and Ashley, L. R. N. (1970). George Peele. p.195.

29th November 1596 — William Wayte craves sureties of the peace against William Shakespeare, Francis Langley, Dorothy Soer, and Anne Lee.

* Facsimile of the writ in SS DL, p.146.

§ When an Elizabethan felt in danger, they could in the Elizabethan legal system crave sureties of the peace against their opponents. To crave sureties, one had to swear that they were in risk of death or mutilation. Their opponent would then be required to hand over a bond, and if they broke the peace, they forfeited the bond. The idea was to discourage violence; though why forfeiting money was considered any more of a deterrent than gaol or being hanged is not entirely clear.[1] Wayte had craved these sureties, anyway, against the two men and two ladies mentioned, and one of the men was Shakespeare.[2]

Sureties of the peace were often claimed as retaliation for previous claims. One person would lay a claim against someone else, and they would retaliate with their own claim. This had been the case here, evidently, because on 3rd November Langley had

craved sureties of the peace against William Gardiner and William Wayte.[3] Francis Langley, who had made the original claim, was the owner of the Swan theatre, which had been built in the winter of 1594/5.[4] The William Gardiner mentioned in this first craving of sureties was the actual person around whom this case evidently revolved: in May and June, Langley had allegedly slandered Gardiner, who was a Justice of the Peace, by saying that he was a perjured knave. This went to court in three separate suits, wherein Gardiner was suing for damages totalling £2200, a enormous sum of money, with which one could for example purchase several houses. Langley replied that Gardiner had in fact perjured himself in a recent case of law; and Gardiner replied that Langley was not referring to that case when he made the slander. But evidently Gardiner was unable to pursue his bombastic claims, because the three suits were not brought to trial.[5]

This forms the backdrop of the sureties incident. Apparently Gardiner then made threats against Langley, and Langley took the action of asking for sureties. William Wayte was Gardiner's stepson, and retaliated for his stepfather.[6] The many records about Gardiner show him to be a considerable scoundrel: he lied, cheated, bullied, intimidated, and extorted his way through society, avoiding fines and using whatever underhanded means he could to gain money and reputation.[7] He cheated Wayte out of his own inheritance, and made him a kind of henchman. Almost all of this information was found by Leslie Hotson in the early 20th century, and though later biographers such as Schoenbaum and Honan tend to use a much lighter rhetoric than Hotson to describe Gardiner,[8] they do not controvert Hotson's facts. Gardiner is not a man whom the records paint kindly, and Wayte seems to have been subject to him.

The situation in general is clear. As Gardiner was a scoundrel, cases like this were always revolving around him. In fact, in 1568 Gardiner had tried to prosecute someone in a suit of slander for the same reason that he suited against Langley: that Gardiner was accused of perjury. In that suit, the details make it clear that Gardiner was working the case up on a technicality.[8] That Langley ran into this character, opposed him, and got embroiled into a long, drawn out disagreement is straightforward enough. What is not clear is what the involvement was of the other

three people asked to provide sureties of the peace by Wayte: Shakespeare, Dorothy Soer, and Anne Lee.

[1] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.4. [2] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.9. [3] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.19–20. [4] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.11. [5] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.25–6. [6] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.32. [7] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.29. [8] SS CDL, p.199 and Honan, p.260. [9] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.35–6.

§ Wayte's claim against Shakespeare and the others had been made in the bailiwick of the sheriff of Surrey. According to the discoverer of the case, Leslie Hotson, this implies that all of the people mentioned were living in that jurisdiction.[1] In October of this year,[2] Shakespeare had been assessed for tax in St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, north of the river. If he was now living south of the river, as the claim by Wayte suggests, then this supports the suggestion of Malone's otherwise unrecorded paper belonging to Edward Alleyn that Shakespeare was living by the Bear Garden at some point in 1596. Since he was assessed for tax in St. Helen's again on 1st October 1598 (q.v.), he probably moved back north of the river at some point afterwards. Perhaps the situation with Gardiner and Wayte had persuaded him that moving near the Bear Garden, perhaps even into the very jurisdiction where Gardiner was a Justice of the Peace,[3] had been a bad idea.

[1] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.11. [2] Q.v. October 1596, and the complicated arrangements regarding the taxation. [3] Hotson, Leslie (1931). Shakespeare versus Shallow. p.23 says that in 1597, Gardiner had the authority to ask Langley to pull down the Swan. The Bear Garden was only about 500 yards from the Swan.

29th December 1596 — Henry Shakespeare of Snitterfield is buried.

[*] EKC F&P2, p.14. From the Snitterfield register.

1597

1597 — Gilbert Shakespeare, William's brother, is working in St. Bride's, London, as a haberdasher.

* SS CDL, p.27.

c.1597 — *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is written.

§ The *Merry Wives of Windsor* has many elements that link it in some way to the Order of the Garter. George Carey, the 2nd Baron Hunsdon, also the patron of Shakespeare's company, had been nominated to the Order of the Garter every year from 1593 to 1596 inclusive. Queen Elizabeth however held no elections in 1594 to 1596 inclusive. When George's father Henry died in July 1596, it was expected that George would follow him as Lord Chamberlain. He did not. That position was taken up by William Brooke, the Baron Cobham, who complained about the use of the name Oldcastle for the character who would be renamed Falstaff in Shakespeare's plays. Tension between the houses of Hunsdon and Cobham seems very plausible. In mid February 1597, it was being rumoured at court that Hunsdon would be elected to the Order of the Garter. On the night of 5th to 6th March 1597, Cobham died, and on 17th April Hunsdon was appointed in his place as Lord Chamberlain. That year, elections for the Order of the Garter were finally held by Elizabeth, for the first time since 1593. It probably seemed all but assured that Hunsdon would finally be elected to the Garter, and indeed he was.[1]

Though the Garter ceremony itself took place in Windsor, very few would have attended. In fact, apart from the four new Garter knights being installed, only three others attended the ceremony in Windsor, and the Queen herself had not attended since 1567.[2] The main focus of festivity surrounding the important event was in the Garter feast, which was held in one of the palaces in London and which all two dozen of the Garter knights attended. In 1597, the Garter feast was at Whitehall Palace in Westminster on the 23rd April. The installation took place the next month, on 24th May at Windsor.[3]

Since the rumours at court that Hunsdon would be elected to the Garter started as early as February 1597, and since this was probably bolstered by his appointment to Lord Chamberlain in March, Shakespeare would have had enough time to write a play for the Garter feast of late April, if commissioned to do so by his patron.[4] This circumstance is more than just likely. Why else would Shakespeare write a play including Falstaff and yet focussed on Windsor and having nothing to do with Henry V? Why otherwise include so many references to the Garter? This date is bolstered by a possible reference in both the *Q1* and *F1* texts of play (*variatim*), to the expiration of the lease on the Theatre which occurred on 13th April 1597.[5]

[1] Summarised from Shakespeare, William (2008p). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford. p.3. [2] There is a reference by a child playing a fairy in Q1 to the "radiant Queene" who "hates Sluts, and Sluttery", which from the point of view of the fairies would refer to the Queen of Fariries, Titania, but in the context of the Garter feast would refer to Queen Elizabeth who was a champion of chastity. [3] Summarised from Shakespeare, William (2008p). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford. p.4. [4] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.511, "Shakespeare's play was probably performed in association with this occasion, and may have been written especially for it". [5] Montgomery, Roy F. (1954). A Fair House Built on Another Man's Ground. Shakespeare Quarterly, 5.2. pp.207–8, and cf. 13th April 1597.

§ The *Merry Wives of Windsor* cannot have been written before 1597 because of the use of Falstaff. Indeed it cannot have been written before the beginning of 2 *Henry IV*, because during the course of that play the home of Justice Shallow moves from near Stamford to Gloucestershire.[1] In *Wives* Shallow is said to live in Gloucestershire, so the play must have been written at least after the change in the middle of 2 *Henry IV*.[2] It has been suggested that the change was due to an interruption in the middle of writing 2 *Henry IV*, that Shakespeare decided to use Gloucestershire for some reason in *Wives*, and then back incorporated that into 2 *Henry IV*.[3] The scenario is attractive because it would incorporate the notion that Shakespeare was suddenly interrupted by the need to write *Wives* due to it being a Garter commission.

Though this scenario is plausible, it requires a plausible suggestion as to why Shakespeare chose Gloucestershire as a new home for Shallow in order to be more certain that he interrupted the writing of 2 *Henry IV* to turn to *Wives*. The suggestion

that Gloucestershire is simply closer to Windsor than the Stamford area—one scholar places it as being half as far[4]—is debated and appears to depend on what points one uses. It is also possible for example to measure the distance from Gloucester to Windsor as about 93 miles, and Stamford to Windsor as about 107 miles, a difference of just 14 miles. The joke is far more likely instead to be about Sir Charles Percy, who, through his wife, was lord of Dumbleton in Gloucestershire. Sir Charles jests, in a letter to a Mr. Carlington of c.27th December 1601, that he has been in the country so long that "at my return I think you will find mee so dull that I shall bee taken for Justice Silence or Justice Shallow", and that "thoutgh [sic] perhaps thee will not exempt mee from the opinion of a iustice Shallow at London, yet I will assure you, thee will make mee passe for a very sufficient gentleman in Glocestrshire".[5] The fact that a "Master Dumbleton" is mentioned in 2 *Henry IV* makes a connection to Sir Charles very likely.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1960). King Henry IV Part 2. Humphreys, A. R. (ed.), Arden. p.235–6. He summarises: "Why he apparently shifted the location thus can hardly be ascertained." [2] The reference to Gloucester appears in the opening words of the play, in Act 1.1, in fact, as though it were particularly significant. [3] Shakespeare, William (2008p). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford. p.13 says for example that this "implies that he interrupted his writing of 2 Henry IV somewhere between 3.2 and 4.2 (the intervening scene, 4.1, deals with the collapse of the rebellion) in order to write the specially commissioned Merry Wives of Windsor". [4] Shakespeare, William (2008p). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford. p.13, citing Shakespeare, William (1971). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Oliver, H. J. (ed.), Arden. p.lv. [5] EKC Allusions, pp.86–7, with the comment by L. Toulmin Smith: "He was the man who bespoke the play of *Richard II*. at the Globe on Saturday, Feb. 7, 1601. He was evidently one of Shakespeare's admirers, perhaps one of his friends." The connection to Master Dumbleton is noted by Toulmin Smith.

§ The fairy section, from "Fairies blacke, gray, greene, and white" to "Till Candles, & Star-light, & Moone-shine be out" in Act 5.5, is in the style of a masque. It has been suggested that since Mistress Quickly and Sir Hugh are bereft of their peculiar verbal mannerisms in this section, it could have been written before the rest of the play, and was perhaps the only thing written for the Garter feast.[1] The fairy section makes reference to the Garter in only F1, and in the section in Q1 Sir Hugh does have his plosive mannerisms, such as "plew" for "blue" and "Pead" for "Bead" (or "Bede" in F1). These two facts indicate that F1 preceded Q1. Analysis of the two texts around the Garter reference in particular shows that Mistress Quickly's speech is represented

in Q1 only by the end of what she says in F1, where "Away begon" (Q1) stands for "Away, disperse" (F1) onwards.[2] This means that the Garter reference is removed altogether in Q1, which is sensible for performance on stage where the reference would be peculiar.

Though the argument about the verbal mannerisms stands as regards F1, there are also reasons to believe that an interpretation of the masque being not very well integrated with the play is wrong. Falstaff's quip about "that Welsh Fairy" is integrated with the national character of Sir Hugh. All of the characters of the play are well integrated into the masque, and the denouement with the Doctor, Slender, and Fenton taking away their respective people with the colours is similarly well integrated. There is also some material in the revised Q1, however, which is appropriate to the scene and yet which does not appear in F1, such as the identification of Falstaff by initial:

If with an F. it doth begin,
Why then be shure he is full of sin.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1973). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Hibbard, George R. (ed.), Penguin. pp.49–50. [2] There is an erroneous suggestion by Shakespeare, William (2008p). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford. p.3 that the Garter reference by Mistress Quickly is removed in Q1 and replaced by a section on "Brokers" and "Seriants". In fact this section replaces the previous "Wher's Bede?" part by Sir Hugh.

§ The fairy masque contains an admixture of apparently early material, and apparently well integrated material. Since the whole play deals with Windsor, and since Garter themes occur in places outside the fairy masque, it seems that the *Merry Wives* was written either for the Garter feast or shortly after. Ben Jonson once boasted that it took him only five weeks to write *Volpone*, a play of about 3,000 lines, and only two months for the writing and preparation for the stage.[1] The *Merry Wives of Windsor* has 3,018 lines. Jonson was using his boast as a retort against the accusation that he was slow to compose plays. If it was a general measure that five weeks was quite fast for a play of 3,000 lines, the suggestion of two months between mid February and mid April for the composition of the *Merry Wives of Windsor* is plausible. There is a tradition, first

reported by John Dennis in 1702, that the Queen commanded Shakespeare to write the play in fourteen days.[2] Perhaps the figure was originally two months, not two weeks, before being distorted by transmission. Rowe reports that the Queen commanded Shakespeare to write a play about Falstaff in love, but does not mention the haste.[3]

It is interesting that there are two early eighteenth century legends connected with the play, independent of one another and both involving the Queen. Craik suggests that Rowe is enlarging the same legend found in Dennis, on the rationale that Dennis would have mentioned the Queen's motivation had he known it and that Rowe is therefore inventing the motivation. But if so, why does Rowe not mention the haste element? The kernel which is present in both stories is that the Queen commanded Shakespeare to write the *Merry Wives*. Dennis mentions haste, and if this is an invented extra component to the story then it is a strange one. Why would the Queen command Shakespeare to write a play quickly? Rowe talks about the Queen's motivation and this makes more sense. It is unlikely that the haste component was invented, because it does not explain anything, whereas Rowe's motivation component does explain to the reader why the Queen commanded Shakespeare to write the play. But it is odd to suggest that because a piece of evidence makes sense, it must therefore be rejected. If Rowe's had been the only surviving independent report of the Queen's involvement with the play, it might have been simply regarded as plausible but unprovable either way. But Dennis's story indicates that the Queen wanted the play written for a particular occasion, because otherwise why command haste? That she wanted a play written for a particular occasion says nothing about her motivation for commanding a particular subject matter, if she did. Dennis's haste component is more likely than Rowe's motivation component because Dennis himself does not explain the reason behind the haste, which means he is unlikely to have invented it for any narrative purpose. Rowe's motivation component may be regarded with more skepticism, but not dismissed, especially since the core of the story, that the Queen commanded Shakespeare to write the play, is so tantalising and admits of so many possibilities.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2010b). The Winter's Tale. Pitcher, John (ed.), Arden. p.87. [2] Shakespeare, William (2008p). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford. pp.4–5. [3] Rowe, Nicholas

(ed.) (1709). The Works of Mr. William Shakespear. Vol. 1. Some Account of the Life, &c. of Mr. William Shakespeare. p.iii.

§ If the story about the Queen being involved with the *Merry Wives* is a true tradition rather than a later legend, it must apply to the whole play, because two weeks for a masque which does not even fill an entire scene would be exceptionally slow. Even if the story is a later legend, it seems less likely that Shakespeare would write a play so thoroughly connected with Windsor and the Garter after the Garter celebrations were over than to be performed in the Garter celebrations themselves. So how are we to explain the circumstance that some of the material used in the fairy masque seems to be earlier, and yet integrates so well with the structure of the play? It may be that Shakespeare reused an earlier masque, written before the year of Hunsdon's Garter installation, and used it in the conclusion of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. But why would he reuse earlier material? Since the material used is the most obvious Garter reference in the play, it may be that Shakespeare had already written some Garter material, a short Garter masque. If he wrote the earlier masque material, it seems likely that he would have done so to prepare for a possible earlier installation of Hunsdon to the Garter; he had been nominated in every year since 1593, but his father was probably not the patron of Shakespeare's company in that year or probably early 1594. Therefore Shakespeare could have written the masque material in either 1595 or 1596.

Only one of these years presents itself as an obvious candidate in relation to the theme of the fairy masque. The use of fairies most strongly connects the masque to the fairies in the plays *Romeo and Juliet* and a *Midsummer Night's Dream*, both of which were most likely written in early 1595. The whole fairy masque is especially similar in style to a *Midsummer Night's Dream*. "Crier Hob-goblyn" (F1) and "Give them their charge Puck" (Q1) allude to the same character, Puck, who appears in *Dream*. The names of the fairies, Cricket (F1), Bean (Q1) and Bead (Q1 and F1), resemble those given to Titania's attendants. The fairies dance through the house in both *Dream* and masque, and the masque dance takes place "till one a clocke", much like the nocturnal sweeping in Theseus' rooms. They have glow-wormes for lanthornes, and tapers in their hands. There is a chastity element which is reminiscent of the imperial votaress

in *Dream*, and the "iuyce of Balme; and euery precious flowre" is very much like the juice of love-in-idleness from *Dream*. Shakespeare had previously shown interest in fairy lore in the monologue by Mercutio about Queen Mab in *Romeo and Juliet*. It was only after this initial interest that he then delved deeply into the themes for his next play, *Dream*. After 1595 Shakespeare seems to have left the fairies in that guise alone, except for the section in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Perhaps Shakespeare had written a Garter masque for Carey, the son of his patron, in 1595, around the time of composition of *Romeo and Juliet* and just before a *Midsummer Night's Dream*. This would be likely in terms of the general productivity of Shakespeare in that year: it is unusual for him to have written three plays in a single year, and may have been wanting to provide strong material for his company with new patronage. In such a scenario, it may be that when it became apparent that no elections were to take place that year, Shakespeare developed the theme into *Dream*, but then reused the masque later on for the *Merry Wives of Windsor*.

c.1597 — 2 *Henry IV* is completed.

§ The previous play in the Henriad, *1 Henry IV* must date to between August 1596 and 5th March 1597, the only period in which the Lord Cobham could have complained about the name Oldcastle. The *Merchant of Venice* was probably being written from July onwards, which makes it more likely that *1 Henry IV* was being written at least after August, and possibly after September too. Cobham would most likely have seen *1 Henry IV* performed at court to complain of the name, and this therefore points to the winter court performances as the venue for the complaint. Since there is no indication in *2 Henry IV* that the name Oldcastle was ever used, whereas in *1 Henry IV* there is ample evidence for it,[1] the second part was probably composed after the winter complaint, pushing the composition of *2 Henry IV* into the early part of 1597.

The question then becomes one of the play's relationship with the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, specifically which one of them was completed first. The matter of the change of Shallow's residence from the midlands to Gloucestershire, halfway through *2 Henry IV*, is relevant in this regard. In the *Merry Wives of Windsor* Shallow is said in the opening lines of the play to be of the county of Gloucester, and the fact that this appears in the

opening lines may indicate some prominence to the joke. If so, then the matter of his changing location half way through 2 *Henry IV* appears to be based on grounds connected with the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. In other words, the prominence of the joke in the *Merry Wives* hints at the grounds of the joke being the occasion of writing the *Merry Wives*,[2] possibly in connection with Sir Charles Percy.[3] On this evidence, therefore, it seems most likely that 2 *Henry IV* was interrupted by the writing of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, which was very likely a play commissioned for the Garter feast of the 23rd April 1597, and that Shakespeare returned to 2 *Henry IV* to complete it shortly thereafter. Shakespeare was in Stratford on 4th May 1597 to purchase New Place; either he finished the play in Stratford,[4] or upon return to London, and perhaps the play received some performances before the closing of the theatres on 28th July 1597.

[1] For example, Fiehler, Rudolph (1955). How Oldcastle Became Falstaff. Modern Language Quarterly, Vol. 16. March 1955. pp.16–28, and Crewe, Jonathan (2003). Henry IV, Part 2: A Critical History. In: Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (eds.). A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. p.433. [2] Cf. e.g. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.537, "Shakespeare may have started to write it in 1597, directly after *1 Henry IV*, but have laid it aside while he composed *The Merry Wives of Windsor*." [3] Cf. 1597 — the writing of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. [4] Compare the later legend reported by Gildon, quoted in EKC F&P2, pp.261–2, that Shakespeare wrote the ghost scenes in Act 1 of *Hamlet* in Stratford. Categorising Shakespeare's life into the rural family background of Stratford and the working professional setting of London may hide the possibility for overlap of activity between the two locations. Compare also the journey of Elizabeth Hall, Shakespeare's granddaughter, into London at the age of 16, in April 1624—q.v. 21st February 1608.

26th January 1597 — John Shakespeare sells a strip of land to George Badger.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.17. Cf. Furnivall, Frederick James and Munro, John James (1910). Shakespeare; Life and Work. p.180, also mentioned without exact date in SS CDL, pp.18–9. These strips of land are sometimes referred to as scantlings.

9th February 1597 — Margaret Shakespeare, wife of Henry Shakespeare of Snitterfield, is buried.

* EKC F&P2, p.14.

17th March 1597 — George Carey, the 2nd Baron Hunsdon, is invested as the Lord Chamberlain, and Shakespeare's company is once again known as the Lord Chamberlain's Men.

* Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1969). The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's Patron. p.104, Bradbrook, Muriel Clara (1978). Shakespeare. p.126, and Massai, Sonia (2007). Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor. p.100.

13th April 1597 — The lease that the recently deceased James Burbage had taken out on the Theatre land expires.

* Thomson, Peter (1992). Shakespeare's Theatre. p.14, and Edmond, Mary (1993). Peter Street, 1553–1609: Builder of Playhouses. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 45. p.104.

§ The petition against James Burbage staging plays at the Blackfriars, lodged in November 1596, was upheld,[1] and James died in February 1597. Just two months later, the lease on the Theatre that Burbage had held also expired. Roy F. Montgomery points out that Shakespeare may allude to the problem of the Theatre lease in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*,[2] where he writes:[3]

Fal. Of what qualitie was your loue then?
Ford. Like a fair house, built on another mans ground,
so that I haue lost my edifice, by mistaking the place,
where I erected it.

Upon losing the Theatre, the Lord Chamberlain's Men moved to the Curtain. Though they did not lose the ability to perform in London, perhaps these circumstances at least partly explain why Shakespeare does not appear to have written any performed plays between 2 *Henry IV*, which was probably finished not long after April 1597, and *Much Ado About Nothing*, which was probably written in late 1598. This year and a half is of apparent inactivity is a long period, especially considering the fact that Shakespeare had written three plays in 1596, two in early 1597, and then wrote not only *Much Ado About Nothing* in later 1598 but then three plays in 1599. Why take such a long break in an otherwise so productive period? That Shakespeare also purchased New Place in Stratford on 4th May 1597 may indicate just that Shakespeare was settling down in

Stratford for a period, and that for example he oversaw architectural alterations to his new house. But it is at least plausible that the theatre situation was a major contributing factor.

[1] Gurr, Andrew (2004c). The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642. pp.6–8. [2] Montgomery, Roy F. (1954). A Fair House Built on Another Man's Ground. Shakespeare Quarterly, 5.2. pp.207–8, also mentioned in Stern, Tiffany (2004). Making Shakespeare. p.13. [3] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Comedies, p.46, Act 2.2. In Q1 the passage is "Fal. Of what qualitie is your loue then? / Ford. Ifaith sir, like a faire house set vpon / Another mans foundation."

23rd April 1597 — Shakespeare patron, George Carey, Baron Hunsdon and Lord Chamberlain, attends the Garter feast as part of his installation into the Order of the Garter.

* Shakespeare, William (2008p). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford. p.4.

4th May 1597 — Shakespeare buys New Place in Stratford.

* Facsimile of the purchase record in SS DL, p.174. It is not clear how much Shakespeare paid for New Place. Eccles, pp.131–2 says that Thomas Greene paid £400 for his own house in 1611, but it was not as large as New Place.

§ Shakespeare purchased New Place just eleven days after the Garter feast which was part of the installation of his patron, George Carey, Baron Hunsdon and Lord Chamberlain, into the Order of the Garter. It is very likely that Shakespeare wrote the *Merry Wives of Windsor* for the occasion. It seems at least plausible, therefore, that the purchase of the house is connected in some way with the furthering of his patron, perhaps even so far as Shakespeare receiving the funds as payment from Carey. It would have taken some time to get to Stratford, and some time to set up the purchase; perhaps eleven days reflects how long this took.

24th May 1597 — Shakespeare's patron, George Carey, Baron Hunsdon and Lord Chamberlain, is installed into the Order of the Garter at Windsor.

* Shakespeare, William (2008p). The Merry Wives of Windsor. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford. p.4.

July 1597 — Pembroke's Men play the controversial *The Isle of Dogs*, by Thomas Nashe and others, at the Swan.

* Wickham, Glynne, Berry, Herbert, and Ingram, William (eds.) (2000). English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660. pp.102–3.

28th July 1597 — The Privy Council orders the theatres to be destroyed, and acting in London to cease.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.113–8.

10th August 1597 — Henslowe mentions, in his diary, the recent injunction against playing.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.113–8.

15th August 1597 — The Privy Council have by now imprisoned some of those involved in the *Isle of Dogs* scandal.

* Bowers, Fredson (ed.) (1980). Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries to Texts in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker. p.264. Shakespeare, William (1960). King Henry IV Part 2. Humphreys, A. R. (ed.), Arden. p.xvii mentions the Privy Council Minutes of this date concerning the scandal.

29th August 1597 — *Richard II* is entered in the Stationers' Register by the bookseller Andrew Wise.

* Arber 3, p.23 / 89, and SS R&I, p.211.

11th October 1597 — The Rose and other theatres were allowed by the Privy Council to reopen, following the *Isle of Dogs* saga on the 28th July.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.43 shows the Admiral's Men starting to perform again on this date, and has a good summary table}.

20th October 1597 — *Richard III* is entered by Andrew Wise in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.25 / 93, and SS R&I, p.211.

15th November 1597 — Shakespeare is listed as a tax defaulter in St. Helen's parish in the ward of Bishopsgate, owing 5s. on goods worth £5.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.162. Cf. Hunter, Joseph (1845). New Illustrations of the Life, Studies, and Writings of Shakespeare. pp.76–79. Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. p.18–20 says that Hunter was the first to point it out. Cf. October 1596 and 1st October 1598.

26th December 1597 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play *Love's Labour's Lost* in front of the Queen; they also perform on 1st January, 6th January, and 26th February 1598.

* EKC F&P2, p.321.

1598

1598 — Richard Barnfield mentions Shakespeare in *Poems in Divers Humors*.

* EKC F&P2, p.195.

c.1598 — *Troilus and Cressida* is perhaps written, but not performed until after revisions are made in 1601.

§ Summary of dating evidence:

10th April 1598 — SR for *Seven Books* by Chapman
7th April 1599 — Henslowe mentions "Troyelles and Creasse" by Dekker and Chettle
June 1601 — the War of the Theatres starts
December 1601 — the War of the Theatres ends
December 1601 — 2 *Return to Parnassus* mentions Shakespeare involved in the war
c.1602 — Middleton alludes to T&C in the *Family of Love*
Late 1602 — "I.C." alludes to T&C in *Saint Marie Magdalen's Conversion*
7th February 1603 — SR of T&C, entered conditionally to James Roberts in Full Court

§ Shakespeare may have made use of the *Seven Books* of the Iliad translated by George Chapman,[1] entered in the Stationers' Register on 10th April 1598,[2] for *Troilus and Cressida*, and certainly his use of Homeric themes increased after that year. Theatre manager Philip Henslowe mentions a work called "Troyelles and Creasse" in his diary on 7th April 1599, and this work was apparently later referred to as *Agamemnon*, perhaps indicating that this work combined the love interest of Troilus and Cressida with the action in the Greek camp;[3] a backstage "platt" survives, which gives the order of events differently to Shakespeare's extant play.[4] In terms of an earliest date, then, 1598 is a probable bound.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2008s). Troilus and Cressida. Muir, Kenneth (ed.), Oxford. p.5. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.743 had also admitted this possibility, saying that "probably Shakespeare read George Chapman's 1598 translation of Books 1–2 and 7–11". They do not, however, mention any possibility that Shakespeare could have composed the play initially in 1598. [2] Arber 3, p.33b / 110,

in a cancelled entry. Cf. Wills, Garry (ed.) (1998). Chapman's Homer: The Iliad. Text in the edition from 1956, preface from 1998. p.xxiii. [3] Shakespeare, William (2008s). Troilus and Cressida. Muir, Kenneth (ed.), Oxford. p.6. [4] EKC ES 4, p.51.

§ Shakespeare's prologue to *Troilus and Cressida*, present only in the 1609 quarto (Q1) and not the First Folio text, refers to Jonson and The War of the Theatres. The anonymous epistle prefacing Q1 embellished events to say that the play had never before appeared on stage,[1] even though the Stationers' Register entry of 1603 and allusions to a play around the same time (q.v. 1601) show that it certainly had been.[2] But it is possible that Q1 was, in a strict sense, accurate: the First Folio may represent the performed text, and the Q1 text may never have been performed. The question especially of why the prologue is missing in Q1 but present in the First Folio is important in that it relates to whether the prologue is an addition to the play or not. If it is, then the reference to the War of the Theatres is a latest possible dating rather than a core dating for the play; *Troilus and Cressida* could have been written as early as 1598, which would otherwise be a year of surprisingly little output for Shakespeare.

The First Folio version of *Troilus and Cressida* generally contains more material than Q1. Ioppolo argues that this material was inserted into the First Folio text rather than removed to form the Q1 text, on the basis that the additions valuably augment the action of the play, and that therefore the Q1 text is the earlier.[3] The prologue is included in this assessment: "Shakespeare apparently revised Troilus and Cressida after composition in order to comment satirically on the War of the Theatres by adding the prologue", with justification for example that the "Quarrell" referred to in the prologue was also "the contemporary term for the Jonson-Marston feud".[4] Ioppolo believes, however, that these revisions were made between 1602 and 1603, which she describes as being "in 'the middle' of the Jonson-Marston-Dekker 'broyles'".[5] But James Bednarz's detailed study of the The War of the Theatres, published nearly a decade after Ioppolo's comments, makes the case that the war ended in 1601: on 25th September 1601, "Jonson, who had finished his third and final comical sature, returned to writing for the public theater, having abandoned the attitude of antagonism he had nurtured for the last two years."[6] The War was not, therefore, in "the middle" between 1602 and 1603, and Shakespeare must have added the prologue when it was relevant: in 1601. Since Ioppolo argues, convincingly, that this

and other material relating to the War of the Theatres was added to the Q1 text, this opens the possibility that the prologue was added to a much earlier text. Since Chapman's translations of the *Seven Books* of the Iliad were published in 1598, and since Shakespeare only wrote one other play in that year, this is the most likely year of the initial composition. Shakespeare was in the same social circle as Chapman,[7] and had definitely read Chapman's translations by early 1599 since he alludes to them in *Henry V* which was written in that period.[8]

Shakespeare had at least written his *Troilus and Cressida* by 1601, as is evident from it being parodied in about 1602, definitely referred to by Cresswell in 1602, and said to have already been acted by 1603 in the Stationers' Register entry. So there appear to have been performances of Shakespeare's play in 1601 and 1602, which makes it more likely that it was first performed in 1601. The most plausible scenario to account for this is that Shakespeare was compelled to write a play about the Troilus and Cressida story in 1598, as were Dekker and Chettle; either they were compelled for the same reason or one of the two plays was written as a response to the other. Shakespeare was perhaps dissatisfied with his original result, but then revised the play when the theme of a futile war became more topical in 1601 as part of the War of the Theatres. In 1601 the play was then performed. This scenario would also help to account for the lack of critical value that the play is perceived to have in comparison with what would have been its surrounding compositions *Hamlet* and *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*. Though *Timon of Athens* could be evidence to the contrary, *Troilus and Cressida* may be more reasonably contextualised as an abandoned experiment between *2 Henry IV* and *Much Ado About Nothing*.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1609c). The Famous Historie of Troylus and Cresseid. EEBO, STC 22332. [2] Arber 3, p.91b / 226, 7th February 1603 Stationers' Register entry: "as yt is acted by my lord Chamberlens Men". Chambrun, Clara Longworth (1957). Shakespeare: a Portrait Restored. p.194 gives an alternative transcription: "as yt is acted by my lo: Chamb[er]lens Men". [3] Ioppolo, Grace (1991). Revising Shakespeare. p.153. Honigmann, E. A. J. (1965). The Stability of Shakespeare's Text. pp.72–3 warns against the assumption that better individual readings are newer, but taken cumulatively the argument is stronger. [4] Ioppolo, Grace (1991). Revising Shakespeare. p.152. [5] Ioppolo, Grace (1991). Revising Shakespeare. p.154. [6] Bednarz, James P. (2001). Shakespeare and the Poets' War. p.221. [7] Hadfield, Andrew (2005). Shakespeare and Republicanism. p.80. [8] Shakespeare, William (1994). Henry V. Taylor, Gary (ed.), Oxford. pp.52–4.

c.1598 — *Much Ado About Nothing* is written.

§ *Much Ado About Nothing* is not mentioned by Francis Meres in his *Palladis Tamia* entered in the Stationers' Register on 7th September 1598.[1] The passage listing some plays of Shakespeare in *Palladis Tamia* is a good indication of which Shakespeare plays were written by September 1598, and in conjunction with other external evidence the omission of a play from Meres makes it likely that it was completed after that date.[2] Speech headings in Q1 of the play printed in 1600 name "Kemp" and "Cowley", and William Kemp left the Lord Chamberlain's Men in about May or June 1599.[3] This evidence, along with the possibility that Shakespeare was writing the first version of *Troilus and Cressida* after 10th April 1598, dates the play with high probability to between the autumn of 1598 and summer of 1599.[4] There is evidence that Shakespeare was at work on *Henry V* by May 1599, and that he wrote *Julius Caesar* thereafter.[5] *Much Ado* was entered in the Stationers' Register, in a strange flyleaf entry,[6] on 4th August 1600, and again on 22nd August 1600.[7]

On the style of the play, Claire McEachern observes that "while the sequencing of Shakespeare's works is a notoriously tendentious exercise, it could be argued that Much Ado's sophistication of comic structure (in which circumstantial blocking mechanisms have become psychological ones) indicates that its theme and character anticipate the problem comedies of the early 1600s."[8] This helps to place it in terms of construction and creative development into the same period indicated by the external evidence. The early bound is less definite than the later bound, so Shakespeare may have been just about to complete the play before Meres went to publication, even accepting Meres as an indication, which means that *Much Ado* was likely written in some period between mid 1598 and the Spring of 1599. Since Shakespeare was hard at work on *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar* in apparently quite quick succession, and since *As You Like It* was also written in 1599, it is more likely that Shakespeare wrote *Much Ado* earlier in the possible range of periods, avoiding an unparalleled sequence of four plays written in quick succession, than later.

[1] Q.v. 7th September 1598. [2] Meres, Francis (1598). Palladis Tamia. EEBO, STC 17834. Part 2, p.282, and q.v. 7th September 1598 for an elucidated argument. [3] Q.v. 16th May 1599, and cf. DLB 263, pp.90–102. The details about Meres, and the Kemp and Cowley speech headings, are given also in

recent editions including Shakespeare, William (2003f). Much Ado About Nothing. Mares, F. H. (ed.), Cambridge. pp.7–8, Shakespeare, William (2005g). Much Ado About Nothing. McEachern, Claire Elizabeth (ed.), Arden. pp.127–8, and Shakespeare, William (2008j). Much Ado About Nothing. Zitner, Sheldon P. (ed.), Oxford. p.5. [4] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.569 use the same evidence to narrow the range to "between summer 1598 and spring 1599", but they do not suggest that *Troilus and Cressida* was being written after 10th April 1598. Q.v. c.1598 — the writing of *Troilus and Cressida*. [5] On *Henry V*, Shakespeare, William (2001b). Henry V. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxv says that the composition was "probably from April or May 1599, before news of Essex's disappointing progress had filtered home that summer", and on *Julius Caesar* the plebeians' argument in Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. p.2 is apposite. [6] Shakespeare, William (2008d). As You Like It. Brissenden, Alan (ed.), Oxford. p.1 gives details of the peculiarity of the entry, inserted on a flyleaf, whose year is only discernible from context. [7] Shakespeare, William (2005g). Much Ado About Nothing. McEachern, Claire Elizabeth (ed.), Arden. pp.125–7. [8] Shakespeare, William (2005g). Much Ado About Nothing. McEachern, Claire Elizabeth (ed.), Arden. p.128.

c.1598 — A scribe practices the name "William Shakespeare" and writes *variatim* quotations from *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* on the cover page to a set of manuscripts containing works by Francis Bacon, Sir Philip Sidney, Shakespeare, and others.

* EKC Allusions, p.40, citing the Northumberland MS. EKC F&P2, p.196 gives an approximate date, followed here. The works by Shakespeare originally included in the set, but now lost, were *Richard II* and *Richard III*. There was also a fragment of the *Isle of Dogs* by Thomas Nashe and others, and a lost work called *Asmund and Cornelia*. Chambers thought the scribe's name to be Adam Dyrmonth, one of the names scribbled on the page.

c.1598 — The Newington Butts playhouse is demolished.

* Braunmuller, A. R. and Hattaway, Michael (2003). The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama. p.8.

24th January 1598 — Abraham Sturley writes to Richard Quiney, partly regarding Shakespeare.

§ Speaking of Richard's father Adrian Quiney, Sturley writes: "Itt semeth bi him that our countriman, M^r. Shaksper, is willinge to disburse some monei upon some od yarde land or other att Shotterie or neare about us; he thinketh it a veri fitt patterne to

move him to deale in the matter of our tithes. Bi the instruccions u can geve him theareof, and bi the frendes he can make therefore, we thinke it a faire marke for him to shoote att, and not unpossible to hitt. It obtained would advance him in deede, and would do us muche good. Hoc movere, et quantum in te est permovere, ne necligas, hoc enim et sibi et nobis maximi erit momenti. Hic labor, hic opus esset eximie et gloriæ et laudis sibi."

[1] DLB 263, pp.67–90. Also mentioned and quoted in Eccles, p.92.

4th February 1598 — Shakespeare is listed as a malt holder.

[*] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.179. Cf. Honan, pp.240–2.

5th February 1598 — William Sadler, son of Shakespeare's friends Hamnet and Judith Sadler, is baptised in Stratford.

§ William Sadler is not widely commented apart from in connection with this baptismal record, where there is a supposition that William Sadler was Shakespeare's godson in reciprocation to Hamnet and Judith Sadler being the godparents of Shakespeare's twins. Germaine Greer notes in passing that all of Judith Sadler's children had apparently left bar one by 1613.[1] In the Diary of Robert Beake, Mayor of Coventry, 1655–6, a William Sadler is "comitted for striking [Thomas] Savage the constable in my sight; he also swore one oath."[2] It is not clear whether this is the same William Sadler. The question of whether William Sadler lived past 1616 is especially important since Shakespeare leaves 20s in his will to godson William Walker.[3] Why therefore would he not also leave money to his other godson, William Sadler? He leaves 26s and 8d to Hamnet Sadler to buy a memorial ring, and though this admittedly seems to be a last minute alteration to the will, this was still a significant bequest.[4]

[1] Greer, Germaine (2007). Shakespeare's Wife. p.285. [2] Fox, Levi (1977). Diary of Robert Beake, Mayor of Coventry, 1655–1656. In: Bearman, Robert (ed.). Dugdale Miscellany I, Vol. 31 of the Publications of the Dugdale Society. p.122. [3] Honan, p.397. [4] SS CDL, p.300, and SS CDL, p.335 footnote 30.

§ Malone says the baptism took place in "1597–8".[1] According to Carol Chillington Rutter, split dates are to be read as ecclesiastical first followed by civil, which means that in this case 1597 is to be read as ecclesiastical and 1598 as civil: "Such discrepancies are acknowledged in the headnotes to the documents by recourse to split dates which juxtapose the ecclesiastical date as it is found on the document with the civil equivalent. An example is Henslowe's first receipts account with Lord Strange's Men which he dates '1591 beginge the 19 of febreary'. The headnote gives the date as '19 February 1591/2'."[2]

[1] Malone, Edmond (1790). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Vol. 1, p.187. [2] Quote and preceding information regarding the two types of reckoning from Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. p.30. Cf. the introduction to the present work for a discussion of the merits of split dates.

25th February 1598 — *1 Henry IV* is entered by Andrew Wise in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.31 / 105, and SS R&I, p.211. Cf. EKC F&P1, p.375.

22nd July 1598 — *The Merchant of Venice* is entered by James Roberts in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.39b / 122, and SS R&I, p.212.

7th September 1598 — The *Palladia Tamia, Wit's Treasury* of Francis Meres, famous for containing a list of Shakespeare plays, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* There is a dedicated copy dated 19th October 1598 (q.v.).

§ Meres mentions twelve of the eighteen undisputed major plays by Shakespeare prior to mid 1598.[1] Of the plays written after 1592 and before that point, he mentions all but one, the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. The following list shows the plays referred to by Meres ordered by the dates calculated herein for the plays. The order in Meres is given in parentheses as a bare number, from (1) et seq. The order amongst the tragedies or the comedies alone is then given by a number prefixed by either "T:" for the

tragedies, or "C:" for the comedies, so that (T:2) is the second in the tragedies, for example, and (C:3) the third in the comedies.

1590 Shrew
1590 Andronicus (11) (T:5)
1590 Edward III
1591 1 Contention
1591 2 Contention
1592 Richard III (8) (T:2)
1592 Verona (1) (C:1)
1593 LLL (3) (C:3)
1593 LLW (4) (C:4)
1594 Errors (2) (C:2)
1595 R&J (12) (T:6)
1595 AMND (5) (C:5)
1595 Richard II (7) (T:1)
1596 King John (10) (T:4)
1596 MV (6) (C:6)
1596 1 Henry IV (9) (T:3)
1597 Merry Wives
1597 2 Henry IV (?)
1598 T&C [draft]
1598 Much Ado

Much Ado About Nothing was probably completed after Meres completed *Palladis Tamia*. Since *1st Henry VI* was probably worked on by many playwrights, in which Shakespeare may not have had even the largest share, it is therefore not included in the list, and it is reasonable to say that Meres includes all major Shakespearean plays after 1591 with the exception of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Since Meres only mentions a *Henry IV* without number, he may also be referring only to the first part, *1 Henry IV*, or to both that and *2 Henry IV*, and so the latter is marked above with a question mark. It is interesting that Meres refers to, for example, Henry IV by that name rather than Sir

John Falstaff, in contrast for example with Henslowe and the revels account officials who were in the habit of referring to plays descriptively and interchangeably.

[1] Meres, Francis (1598). Palladis Tamia. EEBO, STC 17834. Part 2, p.282.

§ Why did Meres not include the *Merry Wives of Windsor*? He gives six comedies and six tragedies, so it may have been that he wanted a round number of each. Since *Merry Wives* was probably written for a Garter performance, it may be that it was less well known in the literary scene than the other plays. Or perhaps it was not performed on the public stage for the first time until long after the initial Garter performance? The play was printed in 1602.[1] The omission of the *Merry Wives of Windsor* means that when Meres does not mention a play whose date is in contention, it is a moderately strong but not certain indication that it was written after 1598.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1602). Syr Iohn Falstaffe, and the Merrie Wiues of Windsor. British Library, STC 22299, BL Huth 48.

20th September 1598 — Sir Toby Matthew writes to Dudley Carlton mentioning Jonson's *Every Man In His Humour*, in which Shakespeare acted, as a new play, and quotes Falstaff's honour catechism.

[*] Shakespeare, William (2006a). As You Like It. Dusinberre, Juliet (ed.), Arden. p.359, and Bradby, Anne (2004). Shakespeare Criticism. p.240. Shakespeare acted in *Every Man In His Humour*, as attested to in the cast list in Jonson, Ben (1616). The workes of Beniamin Ionson. EEBO, STC 14752. p.72.

1st October 1598 — Shakespeare is noted as a tax defaulter in St. Helen's Parish, London.

[*] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.162. Cf. Hunter, Joseph (1845). New Illustrations of the Life, Studies, and Writings of Shakespeare. pp.76–79. Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. p.19–20 says that Hunter was the first to point it out. Cf. October 1596 and 15th November 1597.

19th October 1598 — A copy of Meres's *Palladis Tamia: Wits Treasury*, entered in the Stationers' Register on 7th September, is dated in a dedication.

[*] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1987). John Weever. p.26, and Shakespeare, William (2004d). The Two Gentlemen of Verona. Carroll, William C. (ed.), Arden. p.129.

25th October 1598 — Richard Quiney writes, but does not send, a letter to Shakespeare.

§ "Loveinge Countreyman I am bolde of yo^{w} as of a ffrende, cravinge yo^{wr} helpe wth xxx^{ll} uppon m^{r} Bushells & my securytee or m^{r} Myttons wth me m^{r} Rosswell is nott come to London. as yeate & I have especiall cause yo^{w} shall ffrende me much in helping me out of all the debettes I owe in London I thancke god & muche quiet my mynde w^{ch} wolde nott be indebeted I am nowe towardes the Cowrte in hope of answer for the dispatche of my Buysenes yo^{w} shall neither loase creddytt nor monney by me the Lorde wyllinge & nowe butt perswade yo^{wr} selfe soe as I hope & yo^{w} shall nott need to feare butt wth all hartie thanckefullnes I wyll holde my tyme & content yo^{wr} ffrende & yf we bargaine farther yo^{w} shalbe the paiem^{r} yo^{wr} selfe. my tyme biddes me hasten to an ende & soe I committ this yo^{wr} care & hope of yo^{wr} helpe I feare I shall nott be backe thys night ffrom the Cowrte. haste the Lorde be wth yo^{w} & wth us all amen / ffrom the Bell in Carter Lane the 25 October 1598 /

"Yo^{wrs} in all kyndenes

"Ryc. Quyney"[1]

[1] Facsimile of the letter in SS DL, p.180, and transcript in DLB 263, pp.67–90. Also in Eccles, p.93, who notes that it was probably not sent, because it was found amongst Quiney's papers.

4th November 1598 — Abraham Sturley writes to Richard Quiney mentioning Shakespeare.

§ "Ur letter of the 25. of Octobr came to mi handes the laste of the same att night per Grenwai, which imported a stai of suites bi S$^{r.}$ Ed. Gr. advise, untill &c., and that onli u should followe on for tax and sub. presentli, and allso ur travell and hinderance of answere therein bi ur longe travell and thaffaires of the Courte; and that our countriman M$^{r.}$ W$^{m.}$ Shak. would procure us monei, which I will like of as I shall heare when, and wheare, and howe; and I prai let not go that occasion if it mai sorte to ani indifferent condicions. Allso that if monei might be had for 30 or 40$^{l.}$, a lease, &c., might be procured."[1]

[1] DLB 263, pp.67–90.

§ Also probably by this date, Adrian Quiney had written to his son Richard mentioning Shakespeare: "Yff yow bargen with W$^{m.}$ Sha.. or receve money therfor, brynge youre money homme that yow maye; and see howe knite stockynges be sold; ther ys gret byinge of them at Aysshome."[1]

Loomis dates this to October or November 1598,[2] but presumably an October date makes more sense given the letter that Richard drafted on 25th October. It is strange however that Richard Quiney wrote letters to both Shakespeare and Sturley on that date, and that he did not apparently send the letter to Shakespeare, but did write to Sturley who then replied that he would anxiously await news of how Shakespeare will procure them money. Sturley's prose is slightly obscure, because it sounds as though he is telling Richard Quiney what Quiney himself wrote to Sturley. If so, however, it may be that Richard saw Shakespeare on 25th October in person before he was going to send the letter, and that he discussed with him the arrangements for the financial situation before then writing a tentative letter to Sturley on the subject.

[1] DLB 263, pp.67–90. [2] DLB 263, pp.67–90.

24th November 1598 — Daniel Baker writes to Richard Quiney, possibly in relation to the continuing discussion about borrowing money from Shakespeare.

§ In the letter, Baker suggests that he was, as Lewis puts it, "expecting to receive £20 or £30 from London".[1]

[1] Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). The Shakespeare Documents. Vol. 1. p.230.

26th December 1598 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play in front of the Queen, at Whitehall.

[*] EKC F&P2, p.322.

28th December 1598 — The Theatre is stolen under cover of darkness by the Burbages.

* Wickham, Glynne, Berry, Herbert, and Ingram, William (eds.) (2000). English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660. p.376 is a detailed account. Cf. Sohmer, Steve (1999). Shakespeare's Mystery Play. p.292 for a more speculative view.

1599

1599 — A book of epigrams by John Weever is published, one of which is the earliest known poem addressed to Shakespeare.

§ "Epig 22. Ad Gulielmum Shakespeare.

Honie-tong'd *Shakespeare* when I saw thine issue
I swore *Apollo* got them and none other,
Their rosie-tainted features cloth'd in tissue,
Some heauen born goddesse said to be their mother:
Rose-checkt *Adonis* with his amber tresses,
Faire fire-hot *Uenus* charming him to loue her,
Chaste *Lucretia* virgine-like her dresses,
Prowd lust-stung *Tarquine* seeking still to proue her:
Romea Richard; more whose names I know not,
Their sugred tongues, and power attractiue beuty
Say they are Saints althogh that Sts they shew not
For thousands vowes to them subiectiue dutie:
They burn in loue thy childrẽ *Shakespear* het thẽ,
Go, wo thy Muse more Nymphish brood beget them."[1]

[1] Weever, John (1599). Epigrammes. EEBO, STC 25224. The Fourth Week, Epigram 22. Sig. E6a.

§ Weever says in a dedicatory poem: "If your great highnesse can discend so low / As daigne to view my tender-blushing youth, / That twenty twelue months yet did neuer know", which suggests that he wrote all of the poems before he was twenty years old. On the other hand, Halliwell-Phillipps pointed out that at least one of the epigrams could only have been written in the year of publication.[1] Honigmann, summarising the evidence, says of the Epigrammes in general that they "must have been written over a period of years, more or less completed in 1598, and finally published in the second half of 1599."[2] This means that there is uncertainty about when the non internally dateable poems were written.

Honigmann argues that Weever belonged to the same social milieu as Meres, and that the fact that Weever's "sonnet-epigram" uses a Shakespearean rhyme scheme indicates that Weever had seen Shakespeare's sonnets, just as Meres claims to have done. Weever produces no other epigram using the Shakesperean rhyme scheme, only the one addressed to Shakespeare himself. Additionally, Honigmann reasons that Weever would not have said "more whose names I know not" concerning the names of characters in the plays when Meres had published a list of them in the *Palladis Tamia*, whose dedication was signed 19th October 1598, and that the *Palladis Tamia* was therefore almost certainly published before Weever's *Epigrammes*. It seems reasonable to assume that if Honigmann is right about the social circle then Weever did not have Meres's work to consult when he wrote the epigram on Shakespeare, and was slightly lackadaisical in his approach to praise. On the other hand he did use the Shakespearean rhyme scheme, which Honigmann suggests was a signal to others "in the know" that he had access to these private poems. In the context of homage, though, it seems more likely that it was foremost a nod to Shakespeare's favourite rhyme scheme.

Perhaps Weever simply did not consider the plays of Shakespeare to be very important: his main focus is clearly on the two published poems rather than the plays. But he is unlikely to have said the slightly derisive "more whose names I know not" if he could have easily consulted them in Meres. Honigmann concludes quite reasonably that we "simply do not know when Weever wrote the sonnet-epigram on Shakespeare," but that if he did not have access to the *Palladis Tamia* when he wrote the sonnet, then a pre-1599 date is most likely.[3] Since Weever laments the death of Captain John Upcher, which occurred between March and August 1599, it is certain that he was still preparing the work after, and perhaps also at periods up to, some point between those dates.[4]

[1] HP O2, p.274. [2] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1987). John Weever. p.30. [3] All derived from and commenting upon Honigmann, E. A. J. (1987). John Weever. p.91. [4] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1987). John Weever. p.90.

1599 — *Henry V* is written.

§ *Henry V* was written in 1599, and is one of the easiest plays of Shakespeare to date accurately. This is partly because it contains what has been called the "only explicit, extra-dramatic, incontestable reference to a contemporary event anywhere in the canon",[1] and partly because of other, mainly external, corroborating evidence. The evidence can be broken into three sections: evidence that must have come before the play was written, evidence associated with the play during its writing, and evidence that must be dated to after the play.[2]

Before Writing:

Mid 1597 — Story continued from 2 *Henry IV*
1598 — Alludes to *Seven Books* of the Iliad, by Chapman
Mid 1598 — No mention of it in *Palladis Tamia*, by Meres
Late 1598 / Early 1599 — Writing *Much Ado About Nothing*
Early 1599 — Alludes to *Mansion of Magnanimitie*, by Crompton
Early 1599 — Will Kemp's departure affects the tone of the play?

During Writing:

Early 1599 — Wooden O alludes to the Curtain?
27th March to Mid 1599 — Allusion to Essex campaign
Mid 1599 on — Wooden O alludes to the Globe?

After Writing:

16th October 1599 — Henslowe reacts to the play?
4th August 1600 — Stationers' Register entry
14th August 1600 — Stationers' Register entry

[1] Shakespeare, William (1994). Henry V. Taylor, Gary (ed.), Oxford. p.7, via Shakespeare, William (2001b). Henry V. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxv who cites the 1982 edition. [2] References in the following sections.

§ In 2 *Henry IV*, Shakespeare's epilogue says that "our humble Author will continue the storie, with sir Iohn in it, and make you merry with faire Katharine of Fraunce, where (for any thing I knowe) Falstaffe shall die of a sweat, vnlesse already a be killd with your harde opinions".[1] The continuation of that story, of this part of the historic cycle, is obviously *Henry V*. This dates the play to after the completion of 2 *Henry IV* in around mid 1597.[2]

There are weak allusions to books nine and ten from the *Seven Books* of the Iliad translated by George Chapman,[3] and published at some point in 1598. Though Chapman only published seven books, they were not the first seven books in order; he had published the first, second, and seven to eleventh books inclusive.[4] Chapman dedicated his *Seven Books* translation to Essex.[5]

[1] Shakespeare, William (1600b). The Second Part of Henrie the Fourth. EEBO, STC 22288. Sig. L1v, p.80 by British Library count. NLS Bute.480; Provenance: Crichton Stuart. BL shelfmark, C.34.k.13. [2] Q.v. 1597, writing of 2 *Henry IV*. [3] Shakespeare, William (1994). Henry V. Taylor, Gary (ed.), Oxford. pp.52–4 was the first modern scholar to suggest this outright as far as I know, but the Vocabulary Clues in Robertson, J. M. (1922). Shakespeare Canon. p.45ff. are, despite being outdated with modern digital corpus search, interesting in this connection. Bruster, Douglas (2003). Shakespeare and the Question of Culture. p.186 reports Taylor's argument as the original, and is also interesting in its own regard especially in its extended chorus discussion. [4] Foley, John Miles (2005). A Companion to Ancient Epic. pp.402–3. [5] Hadfield, Andrew (2005). Shakespeare and Republicanism. p.80.

§ Most important of all the events to occur before the writing of *Henry V* in the context of dating is the composition of the *Palladis Tamia* by Francis Meres. He mentions twelve of the eighteen undisputed major plays by Shakespeare prior to mid 1598.[1] Of the plays written after 1592 and before publication, he mentions all but one, the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. It is therefore highly likely that he would have mentioned *Henry V*, especially since *Henry V* is a strong play and his point is that Shakespeare is a great writer, had it been written by the time of composition in mid 1598. The *Palladis Tamia* was entered in the Stationers' Register on 7th September 1598, and there is a dedicated copy dated 19th October 1598.[2]

A similar rationale is useful in dating *Much Ado About Nothing*, which is also not mentioned in the *Palladis Tamia*. There are speech prefixes indicating, however, that Will

Kemp played the part of Dogberry.[3] Since Will Kemp probably left the Lord Chamberlain's Men in early to mid 1599,[4] *Much Ado* must have been written before that date, leaving only late 1598 to early to mid 1599 in which it can have been written, dating the play quite concretely. This means that Shakespeare would have been working on *Henry V* at the earliest right at the beginning of 1599, assuming that he did not write concurrently.[5]

Another work may help to place the writing of *Henry V* after the beginning of 1599. There are allusions in the play to the *Mansion of Magnanimitie*, by Richard Crompton. This was written in about 1596, but not entered into the Stationers' Register until 15th May 1598, transferred on 13th December 1598, and then printed with 1599 on the title page.[6] It is unclear when in 1599 it was printed, whether the title page is entirely accurate, or if there was not a now unknown earlier quarto printed in 1598. Shakespeare could also have seen a draft copy, as it had been printed by Richard Field of Stratford, who printed three works by Shakespeare.[7] But the general evidence makes it likely that he saw it in print towards the beginning of 1599, especially as printers had a "common practice of dating books with the subsequent year so as to make their title pages look more current" as Dobranski says.[8]

[1] Meres, Francis (1598). Palladis Tamia. EEBO, STC 17834. Part 2, p.282. [2] Q.v. those dates. [3] Jackson, MacDonald P. (1990). The Year's Contributions to Shakespeare Studies: Editions and Textual Studies. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 42. p.204, and Shakespeare, William (2005g). Much Ado About Nothing. McEachern, Claire Elizabeth (ed.), Arden. p.278. [4] "In February of 1599, Will Kemp joined other members of the Chamberlain's Men in signing the Globe lease. By autumn of the same year, he was no longer included on the company's cast lists." Helgerson, Richard (1994). Forms of Nationhood. p.223. EKC ES 2, p.326 says that his relinquishment in a share of the Globe "soon after the lease of 21 February 1599 was signed" suggests his departure from the company around then. In EKC ES 2, p.418 he says that shortly "after the house was built Kempe, no doubt on his withdrawal from the company, assigned his interest to Shakespeare, Heminges, and Phillips". He cites Witter vs. Heminges and Condell (1619–20), on which compare 16th May 1599 (q.v.); this shows that he may in fact have relinquished the share before the Globe was even completed. [5] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.595 give a similar assessment, saying that *Henry V* was written "during 1599, probably in the spring." [6] Arber 3, p.36 / 115 for the initial entry into the Stationers' Register, and Arber 3, p.45 / 133 for the transfer. Shakespeare, William (2005d). King Henry V. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.243 for the rest. [7] Schoenfeldt, Michael (2010). The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Poetry. p.122 says that he printed *Venus and Adonis*, the *Rape of Lucrece*, and the *Poetical Essays* containing

Shakespeare's poems *Let the bird of loudest lay* and *Threnos* on the theme of the phoenix and turtle dove. [8]
Dobranski, Stephen B. (2005). Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England. p.158.

§ It is possible that Shakespeare's decision to write *Henry V* as a more serious play is connected with Will Kemp's leaving the Lord Chamberlain's Men in early 1599. Kemp was a physical performer, with a style perhaps akin to what would now be called slapstick, and was well suited to roles such as Dogberry in *Much Ado*. There is no exaltation of the rude comedy in *Henry V* in the way that there was in the *Henry IV* plays. But it is just as likely that Shakespeare wanted to kill off Falstaff and his antic companions simply because he did not like them, much as John Cleese could never understand why people like Basil Fawlty. The writer is less apt to laugh at his own diabolical creations, perhaps, because he sees their deep diabolism more than their superficial humour.

§ The Earl of Essex talked his way into leading an English campaign against the Irish Earl of Tyrone in early 1599. There had been talk of his campaign as early as November 1598,[1] but he departed from London amongst scenes of great national pride on on 27th March 1599, and returned to England defeated and humiliated on 28th September 1599.[2] Between those two dates, news had leaked back to England of the discouraging developments that culminated in his failure.[3] What started out as great enthusiasm at the end of March 1599 turned to dismay, which was a real disaster for Essex and his subsequent career, culminating with his execution in 1601. *Henry V* contains a clear supportive allusion to the Earl of Essex and the campaign in the Chorus to Act V, lines 29–32:

As by a lower, but by louing likelyhood,
Were now the Generall of our gracious Empresse,
As in good time he may, from Ireland comming,
Bringing Rebellion broached on his Sword;
How many would the peacefull Citie quit,
To welcome him? much more, and much more cause,
Did they this *Harry*.

The "Generall" is Essex, and the "gracious Empresse" Elizabeth I, and Henry V's deeds are being compared to those of Essex. Since the Essex campaign was so disastrous, it is peculiar that the reference was kept in the text after September 1599.[4] The text was in fact removed in Q1 printed in 1600,[5] and these lines are known of because of their appearance in the notably coherent text of the First Folio. They probably derive from the original manuscript, or a fair copy of the original manuscript, written of the play in 1599.[6] This suggests that such manuscripts did survive the Globe fire of 1613.[7] Since the reference appears in one of the later choruses of the play, it may be that the departure of Essex happened late in the writing process. At any rate, it means that Shakespeare was probably writing the play still between the end of March 1599, and some time before the bad news came through, in mid 1599.

[1] Dobson, Michael and Wells, Stanley W. (2001). The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare. p.196. [2] Mentioned in e.g. Kiefer, Frederick (2003). Shakespeare's Visual Theatre. p.97. [3] Shakespeare, William (2001b). Henry V. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxv, who says that the composition was "probably from April or May 1599, before news of Essex's disappointing progress had filtered home that summer". [4] Jones, G. P. (1978). Henry V: The Chorus and the Audience. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 31. p.101 also expresses some confusion about this, but posits some probably specious resolutions. [5] Proudfoot, Richard, Thompson, Ann, and Kastan, David Scott (2001). The Arden Shakespeare: Complete Works. p.429. [6] Proudfoot, Richard, Thompson, Ann, and Kastan, David Scott (2001). The Arden Shakespeare: Complete Works. p.429. [7] Cf. 29th June 1613.

§ In the first Chorus of *Henry V*, Shakespeare alludes to the "wooden O" in which the play is being performed. This could be a reference to the Curtain, at which the Lord Chamberlain's Men were playing as they waited for their new playhouse to be constructed from the elements of the Theatre, which had been demolished in late 1598. Or it could be a reference to the theatre after its new construction, the Globe, which became the company's most famous venue.[1] There is no way of telling from the text alone, but most scholars seem to favour the Globe's being completed after May 1599,[2] which would perhaps put the play marginally too late to capitalise fully on the atmosphere surrounding the Essex campaign. In that case, the Curtain is the most likely referent of the wooden O, though it is also likely that the author would have been thinking ahead to the Globe and performance there.

[1] HP O2, p.393 says probably the Curtain. EKC ES 2, p.524 has some good references on the Curtain being round. Shakespeare, William (2005d). King Henry V. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.4

describes the general choice as being dependant on date. [2] For example, Daniell says in Shakespeare, William (1998a). Julius Caesar. Daniell, David (ed.), Arden. pp.15–6 that the "company could have had the new Globe opened from early June 1599", and that a "sharp, and permanent, drop in Henslowe's taking at the nearby Rose Theatre after June 1599 suggests the presence of a rival on Bankside". EKC F&P2, p.415 says of 16 May 1599 that the Globe "may not then have been quite finished".

§ On 16th October 1599, Henslowe paid for a version of *Sir John Oldcastle* to be written. This play contains a riposte to *Henry V*, so the play by Shakespeare was probably being staged by the end of 1599.[1] Certainly it was written by 4th August 1600, because it was entered in the Stationers' Register on that date, and again in a transfer on 14th August 1600.[2] Q1 of the play was published bearing "1600" on the title page, though in a much abridged form, leaving out all of the choruses for example, not just the one which alludes to the failed Essex campaign.[3] Several scenes are cut too, generally those which add a dimension of ponderousness to the play, or equivocate about its nationalistic tint. These were perhaps removed to make the play more popular on the stage.

When Essex departed from London to Ireland the patriotic atmosphere of London would have been something to behold. It would have been sensible for Shakespeare to rush his most patriotic of plays out as fast as he could for as close as possible to that period, to capitalise on this atmosphere. Did the atmosphere convince Shakespeare to write the play in the first place? He had already promised a sequel to *2 Henry IV*, so perhaps by chance he had already got underway with the project. We shall probably never know for sure, but the fact that the Essex allusion occurs so late in the play, and that it is well integrated into the Chorus rather than being an obvious addition, makes it likely that he had already started writing and then by magnificent synchronicity the city erupted into great patriotic fervour as he was putting the finishing touches on the play. The Curtain and Globe must have been thunderous in those heady months of 1599.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2005d). King Henry V. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.1 makes this claim explicit. [2] SS R&I, p.212, Shakespeare, William (2001b). Henry V. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xli, fn.6, and Arber 3, p.63 / 169. [3] Proudfoot, Richard, Thompson, Ann, and Kastan, David Scott (2001). The Arden Shakespeare: Complete Works. p.429.

1599 — *Julius Caesar* is written.

§ The writing of *Julius Caesar* can be dated to 1599 with confidence, mostly due to the number of references to the play in that year and after.[1] The evidence in outline can be categorised into before and after sections:

Before:

7th Sep 1598 (SR) — Not mentioned by Meres
1599 (acted) — Use of the *Shoemakers' Holiday*, by Dekker?
4th / 14th Apr 1599 (SR) — Use of *Nosce Teipsum*, by Davies?
Early to Mid 1599 — *Henry V* contains evidence of thinking about Caesar
c.12th Jun 1599 — The Globe opens, a possible focus for a new play

After:

(All literary allusions to *Julius Caesar*, except for Platter)

1599 (acted) — *Every Man Out of his Humour*, by Jonson
11 Sep 1599 — Platter sees a play of *Julius Caesar*, probably at the Globe
1600 (written) — *Hamlet*
1600 (acted) — *Cynthia's Revels*, by Jonson
1600 (SR) — *Widsom of Dr. Dodypoll*, anonymous
1600 (printed) — *Acolastus his Afterwitte*, by Nicholson
1601 (printed) — *Mirror of Martyrs*, by Weever

The evidence for the earliest possible date being 1599 is lack of reference to the play in the *Palladis Tamia* by Francis Meres,[2] and the reference to Julius Caesar in *Henry V*, a play which is easy to date accurately. The evidence for the latest possible date being 1599 is based on Platter's viewing a play called *Julius Caesar* probably at the Globe in September, and the reference to the play in *Every Man Out of his Humour* by Ben Jonson.

[1] All major recent editions concur on this. Shakespeare, William (1998a). Julius Caesar. Daniell, David (ed.), Arden. p.13, Shakespeare, William (2004b). Julius Caesar. Spevak, Marvin (ed.), Cambridge.

p.1, Shakespeare, William (2005c). Julius Caesar. Wiggins, Martin (ed.), Penguin. p.xxi, Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. p.1. The most dissenting view is by Spevak, who is skeptical mostly of the allusions, but still does not seem to debate the overall case. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.627 on the other hand argue that "minor resemblances with works printed in the early part of 1599" are what help to date *Julius Caesar* to this year. [2] Q.v. 7th September 1598 for an argument about the relative reliability of Meres for dating.

§ Shakespeare mentions Julius Caesar in *Henry V*, Act 5 chorus, following Plutarch except where he mentions the plebeians swarming:

But now behold,
In the quick Forge and working-house of Thought,
How London doth powre out her Citizens,
The Maior and all his Brethren in best sort,
Like to the Senatours of th'antique Rome,
With the Plebeians swarming at their heeles,
Goe forth and fetch their Conqu'ring *Cæsar* in.[1]

This reference comes just before the mention of the Earl of Essex, and therefore just before the internal evidence which most strongly dates *Henry V* to early to mid 1599. Dover Wilson pointed out that this suggests that Shakespeare was thinking about *Julius Caesar* already towards the end of writing *Henry V*. Since there is no reference to the plebeians swarming in Plutarch,[2] this "suggests that he was already devising *Julius Caesar*'s opening scene", as Humphreys says, when writing this chorus.[3]

The use of *Nosce Teipsum* by Sir John Davies, entered in the Stationers' Register on 14th April 1599,[4] is disputed.[5] References to *Musophilus* by Samuel Daniel, registered 9th January 1599,[6] and the *Shoemaker's Holiday*, by Dekker and acted in 1599, are even weaker but still potentially useful indications.[7]

[1] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Histories. p.91. [2] Shakespeare, William (1998a). Julius Caesar. Daniell, David (ed.), Arden. p.13 says that Plutarch wrote "Nowe when Caesar was returned from his last warrer in Spayne, all the chiefest nobilitie of the citie road many dayes jorney from Rome to meete him", with no mention of plebeians. [3] Shakespeare, William (2004b). Julius Caesar. Spevak, Marvin

(ed.), Cambridge. p.5, "Among numerous others, Wilson (NS, p.x) adds lines 26–8 of the prologue of Act 5 of *Henry V*, to suggest that Shakespeare was 'studying' Plutarch in 1599", yet he does not adduce the plebians argument, which is apparently made for the first time in the Oxford edition, Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. p.2. On the same page Humphreys adds that Fluellen's comparison between the king and Alexander the Great may have been a parody of Plutarch. Ironically, then, the Oxford editor makes better use of the old Cambridge editor than the new Cambridge editor does. [4] Arber 3, p.49b / 142 says 14th April, and e.g. Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. p.2 gives the same date. Shakespeare, William (1998a). Julius Caesar. Daniell, David (ed.), Arden. p.14 inexplicably says 4th April. Sir John Davies is not to be confused with John Davies of Hereford. There were in fact at least three men in the period with the name Sir John Davies, according to Grosart, Alexander Balloch (1876). The Complete Poems of Sir John Davies. p.xi. According to Grosart, the author of *Nosce Teipsum* is not the Sir John Davies who was involved in the Essex plot. [5] Shakespeare, William (2004b). Julius Caesar. Spevak, Marvin (ed.), Cambridge. p.2 calls it questionable. Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. p.105 says that Shakespeare's lines "seem to echo" Davies. It is perhaps best called an indication. [6] Arber 3, p.45b / 134 does not contain this entry. [7] Shakespeare, William (1998a). Julius Caesar. Daniell, David (ed.), Arden. p.14 and Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. p.2 agree on 9th January for the Stationers' Register entry. Shakespeare, William (2005c). Julius Caesar. Wiggins, Martin (ed.), Penguin. pp.116–7 gives the possible Dekker parallel.

§ Thomas Platter, a doctor from Basel in Switzerland,[1] saw a play on the south bank of London about Julius Caesar on 11th September 1599 in the Julian calendar, which was 21st September in his native Gregorian calendar.[2]

"On the 21st of September, after dinner, at about two o'clock, I went with my party across the water; in the straw-thatched house we saw the tragedy of the first Emperor Julius caesar, very pleasingly performed, with approximately fifteen characters; at the end of the play they danced together admirably and exceedingly gracefully, according to their custom, two in each group dressed in men's and two in women's apparel."[3]

Since Platter talks about *the* straw-thatched house, he most likely refers to the playhouse which was newly built with thatch, i.e. the Globe, rather than the Rose or the Swan. The new thatch would have been more prominent in the London skyline, and the most likely referent. Moreover Henslowe's accounts do not show a performance of a play about Julius Caesar from this period, which only leaves the less popular Swan to compete with the Globe for being the theatre that Platter identifies.[4]

[1] Shakespeare, William (1998a). Julius Caesar. Daniell, David (ed.), Arden. p.12. [2] Shakespeare, William (2005c). Julius Caesar. Wiggins, Martin (ed.), Penguin. p.lvii. [3] A translation, from Schanzer, Ernest (1956). Thomas Platter's Observations on the Elizabethan Stage. Notes and Queries, 3.11. p.466. [4] Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. p.1 quotes Dover Wilson for the roof argument, and gives the argument about Henslowe's accounts.

§ There are possible allusions to *Julius Caesar* in *Every Man Out of his Humour*, written in 1599 by Ben Jonson and entered in the Stationers' Register on 8th April 1600;[1] *Hamlet*, written in 1600 by Shakespeare;[2] *Cynthia's Revels*, by Ben Jonson and acted in 1600;[3] the *Wisdom of Dr. Dodypoll*, author unknown, entered in the Stationers' Register on 7th October 1600;[4] *Acolastus his Afterwitte*, by Samuel Nicholson and printed in 1600;[5] and the *Mirror of Martyrs*, by John Weever, printed in 1601.[6]

[1] Every Man: Acted Shakespeare, William (2004b). Julius Caesar. Spevak, Marvin (ed.), Cambridge. p.5, Stationers' Register Arber 3, p.58 / 159. [2] Hamlet. Honigmann, E. A. J. (1956). The Date of Hamlet. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 9. p.29. [3] Cynthia's Revels. Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. pp.3–4. [4] Dr. Dodypoll. Arber 3, p.65b / 174. [5] Acolastus. Shakespeare, William (2004b). Julius Caesar. Spevak, Marvin (ed.), Cambridge. p.5. [6] Mirror of Martyrs. Shakespeare, William (2008f). Julius Caesar. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford. p.3.

§ It is unusual for Shakespeare to have written three plays in a year, with an additional one in the autumn and winter of the year preceding. The biggest event in 1599 was the opening of the Globe theatre, and the increase in output seems as likely to be connected with this as with any increase in creative imagination from Shakespeare. Yet there is also a clear turning point in the maturity of his plays in this year, and the extra writing perhaps cultivated that this maturity as well as allowing for its expression. The fact that Shakespeare took on writing *Henry V*, in which he complains that the story is very difficult to represent on stage, and then *Julius Caesar*, covering another famous event, may also reveal his growing confidence.

c.1599 — *As You Like It* is completed.

§ *As You Like It* is not mentioned by Francis Meres in 1598, which provides a good but not watertight indication that it was not written by September 1598.[1] Several lines referred to as an epilogue were written for a play performed at court during Shrovetide, February 1599. It has been argued that these lines form a plausible

continuation to the end of *As You Like It*,[2] but the authorship and circumstances are debatable. The part of Touchstone is sometimes judged to be, as Furness puts it, a "fool" rather than a "comic clown", a change in style which may reflect William Kemp's leaving the Lord Chamberlain's Men early in 1599 to be replaced by Robert Armin.[3] Nick De Somogyi points out that Armin wrote the part of Tutch the clown for himself in the *Two Maids of More-Clack*, whose name bears a phonetic similarity to Touchstone, and a touchstone is a material used in the goldsmith trade in which Armin was apprenticed.[4]

The reference to the fact that "the little wit that fools have was silenced" in Act 1.2 may be a topical allusion to the suppression of certain works which were ordered burned on 1st June 1599.[5] The ages of man speech by Jaques may parallel what Oldys says used to be the motto of the Globe theatre, "Totus mundus agit histrionem" ("The whole world plays the actor"). The evidence relating to whether the Globe did indeed bear this motto is ambiguous, but plausible.[6] The song "It was a lover and his lass" appears in a book published in 1600 but with a preface saying it was composed in the vacation time, which could refer to June to September 1599.[7] The song in the book is in a more consistent and viable order than the song as it appears in the First Folio.[8] There is no known quarto or any other edition of the play prior to its appearance in the First Folio. There is some thematic parallelism between the melancholy figure of Jaques and Hamlet.[9] Taken in conjunction, these indications point to a 1599 date for the play, more likely later in the year than earlier, and therefore between *Julius Caesar* and *Hamlet*.

[1] Meres, Francis (1598). Palladis Tamia. EEBO, STC 17834. Part 2, p.282, and q.v. 7th September 1598. Mentioned in Shakespeare, William (2006a). As You Like It. Dusinberre, Juliet (ed.), Arden. p.36, and Shakespeare, William (2008d). As You Like It. Brissenden, Alan (ed.), Oxford. p.4. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.655 use the 4th August 1600 Stationers' Register entry (q.v.) as a latest possible date, saying that the play "was probably not written long before." [2] Shakespeare, William (2006a). As You Like It. Dusinberre, Juliet (ed.), Arden. p.349. [3] Shakespeare, William (1890). As You Like It. Furness, Horace Howard (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 8. p.300, and Lynch, Stephen J. (2003). As You Like It: a Guide to the Play. p.125. Shakespeare, William (2006a). As You Like It. Dusinberre, Juliet (ed.), Arden. p.45 notes the theory, but dismisses it, supporting the Shrovetide epilogue theory. See also Shakespeare, William (2006a). As You Like It. Dusinberre, Juliet (ed.), Arden. p.112 about Armin being a singer, unlike Touchstone, and not a dancer, as Touchstone is. [4] Shakespeare, William

(2003c). As You Like It. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxx. It is not clear whether Armin joined the Lord Chamberlain's Men in 1599 or 1600, and Shakespeare, William (2009a). As You Like It. Hattaway, Michael (ed.), Cambridge. p.53 says he could have taken over the part of Touchstone "only later" without giving any evidence for example for a date. De Somogyi's suggestion is more concrete. Scouten, Arthur Hawley (1997). Lear from Study to Stage. p.127 says he may have joined as early as 1598. [5] Fleay suggested this, according to Shakespeare, William (1890). As You Like It. Furness, Horace Howard (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 8. p.303. Shakespeare, William (2009a). As You Like It. Hattaway, Michael (ed.), Cambridge. p.51 says it may be an insertion. [6] Abrams, Richard (2007). Oldys, Motteux, and 'the Play'rs old motto': the 'Totus Mundus' Conundrum Revisited. Theatre Notebook, 61.3. p.122. Abrams, speaking of the evidence, concludes that though "these factors do not add up to proof of a Globe motto, they do urge caution in dismissing the tradition". [7] Shakespeare, William (2008d). As You Like It. Brissenden, Alan (ed.), Oxford. p.4, an intriguing suggestion, though one which does of course depend on when in 1600 the book was published. [8] Shakespeare, William (2009a). As You Like It. Hattaway, Michael (ed.), Cambridge. pp.50–1. [9] Tomarken, Edward (1997). As You Like It from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays. Editorial piece. p.30 comments on Jaques being developed into Hamlet. Schoenbaum, S. (1991). Shakespeare's Lives. p.220 notes the melancholy preoccupation first starting in Jaques.

c.1599 — *The Passionate Pilgrim* is published.

* The circa in this date refers to the publication of the first edition, which may have been printed in late 1598. There was definitely an edition printed with 1599 on the title page, the second known edition.

§ *The Passionate Pilgrim* is an octavo anthology of verse by various authors, including Shakespeare, which nonetheless declares itself on the title page to have been written solely by Shakespeare. The intention of the publisher, William Jaggard, was probably to capitalise on the success of *Venus and Adonis* by taking a small amount of material from Shakespeare which he had acquired, and then padding with poems from other authors who could be at least nominally passed off as Shakespearean. The copyright in *Venus and Adonis* was owned by the bookseller W. Leake, the same bookseller whom Jaggard used to sell *The Passionate Pilgrim*, which may indicate a deliberate ploy by Jaggard to get people to buy this new work when they were also buying the old. Sadly the title page of the first edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* has not survived, but the title page of the second edition is dated 1599. The printer, T. Judson, set up his press only in late 1598, so the first edition was produced either in late 1598 or in 1599.[1]

[1] Derived from Burrow, Colin (ed.) (2002). The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Sonnets and Poems. pp.74–5.

§ Of the twenty poems selected for inclusion in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, only five are known for certain to be by Shakespeare. Most of the others are of currently unknown authorship:[1]

(1) Shakespeare, Sonnet 138 *variatim*
(2) Shakespeare, Sonnet 144 *variatim*
(3) Shakespeare, from *Love's Labour's Lost*
(4) Unknown
(5) Shakespeare, from *Love's Labour's Lost*
(6) Unknown
(7) Unknown
(8) Richard Barnfield, from his *Encomion of Lady Pecunia* (1598)
(9) Unknown
(10) Unknown
(11) Bartholomew Griffin, from his *Fidessa more Chaste than Kinde* (1596)
(12) Unknown, derived from Thomas Deloney, *Garland of Good Will* (1593)
(13) Unknown
(14) Unknown
(15) Unknown
(16) Shakespeare, reduced from *Love's Labour's Lost*
(17) Unknown, published in Thomas Weelkes, *Madrigals* (1597)
(18) Unknown
(19) Christopher Marlowe and Sir Walter Raleigh
(20) Richard Barnfield, from his *Poems in Divers Humors* (1598)

The two Richard Barnfield sources given above, *The Encomion of Lady Pecunia* and *Poems in Divers Humors*, are the two separately named parts of a single work. This was published by John Jaggard, the brother of the publisher of *The Passionate Pilgrim*, William Jaggard. All of the poems except those from Barnfield's work are contended by Kirschbaum to be from MSS copy.[2]

[1] All from HP O1, pp.401–4, with the exception of the attributions of 12 and 17 from Cheney, Patrick Gerard (2007). The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Poetry. pp.114–6. [2] Kirschbaum, Leo (1955). Shakespeare and the Stationers. p.116.

c.1599 — George Buc inscribes a copy of *George a Greene* with a testimony by Shakespeare regarding its authorship.

§ The play *George a Greene* was entered in the Stationers' Register on 1st April 1595, but was not published until 1599. On the title page of a copy of this quarto, George Buc wrote the following lines interspersed between the printed lines of the title:

Written by . . . . . a minister, who ac[ted]
the piñers prt in it himself. Teste W. Shakespea[re]

Ed. Iuby saith that this play was made by Ro. Gree[ne]

The interpolated letters are from a portion of the document which has now been cropped, but of which an early transcription survives. The authenticity of these lines has been questioned, but a comprehensive study by Alan H. Nelson in 1998 made an excellent case for their being a genuine Buc holograph. Knighted in 1603,[1] Sir George Buc was Master of the Revels from 1610, which meant that he had the responsibility of censoring the late plays of Shakespeare and approving them for court performance. Nelson points out that no quarto printed after 1605 is known to have been inscribed by Buc, and that there is evidence to suggest that he was in the habit of inscribing copies more or less as soon as he procured them. The evidence therefore points to the notes being inscribed close to or in 1599. Nelson believes that the notes were made "on two different occasions, or at least with two different quill pens".[2]

Edward Juby was an actor who was known to be involved with the theatre from 1594 up until his death in 1618, by which time he had a share in the Fortune theatre. He was apparently a close friend of the famous actor Edward Alleyn, and acted often in a business capacity with the troupes, receiving money.[3] Perhaps in this respect he fulfilled a somewhat similar role to Augustine Phillips, and John Heminges, in the

King's Men. The Robert Greene to whom Juby refers is presumably the infamous pamphleteer and dramatist since Buc adds no qualification.

There are few things that can be added to the notes themselves. It is impossible to tell for sure whether Shakespeare did not remember the name of the minister, or whether he told Buc and then Buc himself forgot the name Shakespeare had told him before he was able to write it down. The former is however more likely since if Shakespeare had known and Buc had just forgotten, Buc could have asked Shakespeare again. This is reinforced by the fact that he later receives the testimony of Juby, so he probably continued to actively search for information about the author. That Buc continued to search for evidence may suggest that he was unhappy with the veracity of what he received from Shakespeare, though it may also have been no more than an attempt to fill in the dotted space for the author. Alan H. Nelson characterises the play as anonymous, and there is no obvious argument made that the matter of the actual authorship of the play has been at any point settled. Since Shakespeare and Juby's evidence conflicts, at least one of them is incorrect, and perhaps both. The fact that Shakespeare and Juby are cited may provide an indication that they each were to some degree considered reliable sources for such information, or that they were friends in some capacity with Buc—certainly they were at least in communication. It is a beautiful irony that George Buc should have had such problems attributing an Elizabethan play properly even though he had access to Shakespeare and Juby. It shows how difficult a task modern historians have when they attempt to solve the same problem.

[1] Nelson, Alan H. (1998a). Calling All (Shakespeare) Biographers! Or, a Plea for Documentary Discipline. In: Kozuka, Takashi and Mulryne, J. R. (eds.). Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson. p.58. [2] All facts except for the knighthood datum from Nelson, Alan H. (1998b). George Buc, William Shakespeare, and the Folger George a Greene. Shakespeare Quarterly, 49.1. pp.74–83. [3] Cerasano, Susan P. (1998). Women as Theatrical Investors. In: Cerasano, Susan P. and Wynne-Davies, Marion (eds.). Readings in Renaissance Women's Drama. pp.89–90.

c.1599 — William Scott writes about two works of Shakespeare in his short treatise on poetry, *The Model of Poesy*.

§ William Scott was a great-grandson of the poet Sir Thomas Wyatt, who introduced the sonnet into English, and a relative (one author says nephew)[1] of Sir Henry Lee, the Master of Ordnance under Elizabeth. *The Model of Poesy* was dedicated to Lee. Scott describes having written the work during an academic vacation. The British Library manuscript catalogue entry summarises the dating evidence from allusions within the work:

"Josuah Sylvester's 'very well-labour'd & commendable translation of the seconde weeke of Bartas' (f. 42v) was entered in the Stationers' Register on 21 April 1598. The description of the Earl of Essex as 'that famous Generall of the Armye of the most famous Prince, of whome one sayes he is the true Image of the Achillean vertues' (f. 31) alludes to the dedication of Chapman's Seaven Bookes of the Iliades of Homer, entered on 10 April 1598, and may predate Essex's fall in 1600/1."[2]

The entry neglects to mention that Essex is praised as swift-footed, which may refer to his passage back from Ireland in 1599.[3] Since the fortunes of Essex decreased after his return from Ireland, with his being put under house arrest in October 1599 and then tried in June 1600, the praise given to Essex in *The Model of Poesy* would be most appropriate during the 1599 summer academic vacation. This can only be so, of course, if the author did not form part of the Essex clique. Unfortunately this is not beyond doubt, as another nephew of Sir Henry Lee, Captain Thomas Lee, was part of the rebellion in 1601. Suffice it to say that the book was written in the range 1598–1600 inclusive, with the likelihood being 1599.

The two works of Shakespeare quoted and commented on in *The Model of Poesy* are *The Rape of Lucrece* and *Richard II*. The former is described in passing as a well penned poem, but one line is criticised for tautology. The latter is however quoted several times, and is generally cast in an admiring light. Neither work is explicitly attributed to Shakespeare.

[1] Heaton, Gabriel (2010). Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments. p.30. [2] British Library MSS cat. entry for Add. 81083, accessed July 2010. [3] Wells, Stanley (2003). By the Placing of his Words. Times Literary Supplement. Issue 5243, 26th September 2003. pp.14–15.

1st January 1599 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play in front of the Queen, at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.322.

12th January 1599 — The Corporation of Stratford pays John or William Shakespeare tenpence for one load of stone.

§ This fact was discovered by Halliwell-Phillipps in the chamberlain's accounts for this year, and first published in his *Life of William Shakespeare* in 1848. The entry reads "Pd. to Mr. Shaxspere for on lod of ston - - - - x.d.".[1] Halliwell says the stone was sold to the Corporation of Stratford, "probably from his garden at New Place". Theobald said of New Place in 1733 that Shakespeare "repair'd and modell'd it to his own mind", as well as naming it. Halliwell-Phillipps points out that the naming was not conducted by Shakespeare, but that Theobald knew Sir Hugh Clopton, from whom this information is apparently derived. The repair and modelling may therefore, Halliwell-Phillipps says, be accurate, in which case it is plausible that the stone which was sold to the corporation was from these New Place building works. The stone was purchased by the corporation to go towards the repair of the Clopton Bridge, the main bridge in the Stratford vicinity.[2]

[1] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.179. Cf. Halliwell, James Orchard (1848). The Life of William Shakespeare. p.171. [2] HP O2, p.373. See also EKC F&P2, p.96 and SS CDL, p.179.

§ Shakespeare purchased New Place on 4th May 1597 (q.v.), which might appear to leave a long period to be working on the site until the purchase of the "lod of ston", if it is related to the repairs and upgrades made after the house was purchased. It may be useful to compare the situation of Thomas Greene, who was staying at New Place on 9th September 1609 (q.v.) while he waited for the purchase and repair of the house that he wanted. He did not want to move into the house until it was both bought and repaired. Greene was having problems, however, getting the timber that he needed, and was anyway quite happy to stay at New Place. The situation continued, and though Greene had wanted the purchase to take place before about

March 1609, and the repairs by about September, it seems he may not have been able to even purchase the house until perhaps the summer of 1611.

Potential factors that may have prevented building works from taking place immediately in the case of Shakespeare and New Place may have been exacerbated by the playwright's regular need to be in London, and the size of New Place itself. It was the second largest house in Stratford.[1] So despite the fact that Greene provides an indication for thinking that wanting to purchase and repair before moving in was an accepted practice, there are potential mitigating factors in these two cases. Greene had another place to stay that he apparently liked, and so he probably did not rush to complete his own house. Shakespeare may simply have let the work languish out of the necessity of being in London; the repairs may have simply taken so long because New Place was such a large house; or leftover stone may have been retained after repairs had been made.

[1] SS CDL, p.234 says that the largest was the "old College, Crown property leased in 1596 to Thomas Combe".

20th February 1599 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men perform in front of the Queen.

* EKC F&P2, p.322.

21st February 1599 — A syndicate was formed for the leasing, construction, and running of the Globe, and the formal lease is signed on this day.

* SS CDL, p.210. Also in Thomson, Peter (1992). Shakespeare's Theatre. p.65, and Shakespeare, William (2005d). King Henry V. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge. p.4.

6th March 1599 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play "Sir John Old Castell" at a dinner for the Flemish ambassador, Vereiken, given by the Lord Chamberlain.

§ Chambers thinks that the performance was at Hunsdon House in Blackfriars.[1] That Whyte refers to the play as *Sir John Oldcastle* may indicate that the Lord Chamberlain's Men had renamed the play, or at least the character of Falstaff, to a state prior to the intervention of the Lord Cobham. Perhaps they made such a change due to the recent

opening of performances of a *Sir John Oldcastle* play which was commissioned by Henslowe as a response to the Falstaff plays of the Lord Chamberlain's Men. A text of the play that Henslowe commissioned was entered in the Stationers' Register on 11th August 1600 (q.v.).

[1] All from EKC F&P2, p.322. Chambers dates this to 1600, but DLB 263, pp.90–102 dates it to 1599.

8th March 1599 — Possible allusion to *1 Henry IV* in a letter by Rowland Whyte to Sir Robert Sidney.

§ Rowland Whyte writes to Sir Robert Sidney: "All this Weeke the Lords have bene in London, and past away the Tyme in Feasting and Plaies; for Vereiken dined upon Wednesday, with my Lord Treasurer, who made hym a Roiall Dinner; upon Thursday my Lord Chamberlain feasted hym, and made hym very great, and a delicate Dinner, and there in the After Noone his Plaiers acted, before Vereiken, Sir John Old Castell, to his great Contentment."[1]

[1] DLB 263, pp.90–102.

7th April 1599 — Henslowe lent three pounds to Dekker and Chettle for the writing of their *Troilus and Cressida*.

[*] Shakespeare, William (1998e). Troilus and Cressida. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Arden. p.376. Cf. c.1598 for the writing of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*.

16th May 1599 — An inventory of the property of Thomas Brand mentions Shakespeare and the Globe.

§ Will Kemp probably left the Lord Chamberlain's Men around this period. In a lawsuit, *Witter vs. Heminges and Condell* from 1619–20, the defendants Heminges and Condell say that Kemp sold his share in the Globe to Shakespeare, Heminges, and Phillips.

"But the said defendantes do say that about the time of the building of the said Playhowse & galleryes or shortlie after a third parte of the fiveth parte of the said

Moitie of the said Playhowse galleryes gardens & ground which was the fiveth parte of the said William Kempe did come unto the said Augustine Phillipps by a graunt or assignement of the said fiveth parte made by the said William Kempe to the said William Shakespeare the said John Heminges one of the said defendantes and the said Augustine Phillips."[1]

About the time of the building of the Globe or shortly after is not extremely specific, but it indicates perhaps that they remember Kemp wasn't around to play at the Globe at all.

[1] DLB 263, pp.90–102.

16th May 1599 — A royal proclamation forbids the staging of plays except where permitted by local or royal officials.

* DLB 263, pp.90–102, which says "On 16 May 1599 Queen Elizabeth I issued the following proclamation forbidding the production of plays (Interludes) except as permitted by local or royal officials and urging her 'nobilitie and gentlemen' to keep their players as liveried servants."

1st June 1599 — The Archbishop of London declares that many books and kinds of books were to be burned and suppressed.

* Honigmann, E. A. J. (1987). John Weever. p.30.

c.12th June 1599 — The Globe may have opened around this date.

* Speculated by Sohmer, Steve (1997). 12 June 1599: Opening Day at Shakespeare's Globe. Early Modern Literary Studies, 3.1. Sections 1.1–46. See also a rebuttal at Egan, Gabriel (2000). Review of Shakespeare's Mystery Play. Early Modern Literary Studies, 5.3. Sections 9.1–10. That the Globe at least opened in this part of the year is reasonable.

July 1599 — John Shakespeare had pursued John Walford for debt.

* SS CDL, p.31, who dates the lawsuit to Trinity Term in this year, which runs from about mid April to the end of June. Cf. 4th November 1568.

8th July 1599 — The Countess of Southampton, Elizabeth Wriothesley, sends a letter to her son the Earl of Southampton mentioning Falstaff.

§ "All the nues I can send you that I thinke wil make you mery is that I reade in a letter from London that Sir John Falstaf is by his M^rs^ Dame Pintpot made father of a godly milers thum, a boye thats all heade and veri litel body; but this is a secrit."[1]

[1] EKC F&P2, p.198. Chambers guesses at Henry Lord Cobham as the identity of Sir John Falstaff, but notes that he had no children. Perhaps, in fact, he did, but the secret was well kept.

11th September 1599 — Thomas Platter sees *Julius Caesar* at the Globe.

* Shakespeare, William (2005c). Julius Caesar. Wiggins, Martin (ed.), Penguin. p.lvii. Cf. 1599, the writing of *Julius Caesar*.

2nd October 1599 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men are paid £30 as an advance for their performances on 26th December 1599, 1st January, and 20th February.

* Shakespeare, William (2006a). As You Like It. Dusinberre, Juliet (ed.), Arden. p.37.

6th October 1599 — Shakespeare is included in the *Residuum London* tax accounts.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.163.

6th October 1599 — Henslowe records his first taking for the galleries at the Rose since 3rd June, recording lower profits perhaps because of the recently opened Globe.

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.168–9.

17 November 1599 — After this date but before 24th March 1600 a record is made of John Shakespeare having made an application to impale his Coat of Arms with those of the Arden family.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.170. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.20–3.

26th December 1599 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play in front of the Queen at Richmond.

* EKC F&P2, p.322.

1600

1600 — *Hamlet* is written and staged.

§ *Hamlet* is not mentioned in the *Palladis Tamia* of Francis Meres, entered in the Stationers' Register on 7th September 1598. The *Palladis Tamia* contains a good indication of which Shakespeare plays were written by September 1598, and in conjunction with other external evidence the omission of a play from this work makes it likely that it was completed after that date.[1] *Hamlet* was entered in the Stationers' Register on 26th July 1602, and this entry refers to the play as having been lately acted by the Lord Chamberlain's Men.[2] There are three texts of *Hamlet* prior to and including the First Folio. The first is a defective, reported text issued as Q1 (1603). The second is a good text apparently set from Shakespeare's papers or from a copy of them, Q2 (1604 and 1605). The third is the play as it appears in the First Folio, F1 (1623), which stands in ambiguous relation to the prior texts, but is most likely a revision of the Q2 state.[3]

[1] Meres, Francis (1598). Palladis Tamia. EEBO, STC 17834. Part 2, p.282, and q.v. 7th September 1598 for an elucidated argument. [2] Shakespeare, William (2008e). Hamlet. Hibbard, G. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.3 and Shakespeare, William (2005b). Hamlet. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Arden. p.49. [3] Shakespeare, William (2008e). Hamlet. Hibbard, G. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.3.

§ Shakespeare mentions Julius Caesar twice in Q2.[1] The first of these references is not present in either Q1 or F1, whereas the second appears in all. The first refers to the portents that appeared in the streets of Rome before the assassination of Caesar, as portrayed with great effect in *Julius Caesar*. The second comes when Polonius, or Corambus as he is called in Q1, says to Hamlet that he acted Julius Caesar in the university, and was killed in the Capitol by Brutus. The parts Polonius and Hamlet were probably acted by the same actors as those playing Julius Caesar and Brutus respectively in *Julius Caesar*. The joke, then, is that once again Richard Burbage, acting Hamlet, would be killing the same actor who played both Julius Caesar and Polonius. This implies that *Julius Caesar* came before *Hamlet*.[2] Caesar and Polonius are presumed to have been acted by John Heminges.[3] This may also indicate that *Julius Caesar* was performed at one of the universities. The first reference can be seen as an advert for

Julius Caesar, or just a reminiscence, whereas the second is a clear inter-dramatic joke. These references date *Hamlet* to after the composition of *Julius Caesar* in mid 1599.[4]

[1] Shakespeare, William (2008e). Hamlet. Hibbard, G. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.3, Shakespeare, William (2005b). Hamlet. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Arden. pp.49–50. [2] Shakespeare, William (2008e). Hamlet. Hibbard, G. R. (ed.), Oxford. pp.3–4, Shakespeare, William (2003d). Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Edwards, Philip (ed.), Cambridge. p.5. [3] Honigmann, via Shakespeare, William (2003d). Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Edwards, Philip (ed.), Cambridge. p.5. [4] The Arden edition, Shakespeare, William (2005b). Hamlet. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Arden. pp.49–50, is skeptical about the *Julius Caesar* references. The Cambridge and Oxford editions accept it.

§ Gabriel Harvey bought a copy of Speght's *Chaucer* (1598), and twice inscribed it with both his name and the date "1598".[1] He continued to annotate the work after he bought it.[2] One of the annotations is a long passage about the state of contemporary literature, and makes two references to Shakespeare:[3]

"Heywoods proverbs, with His, & Sir Thomas Mores Epigrams, may serve for sufficient supplies of manie of theis devises. And now translated Petrarch, Ariosto, Tasso, & Bartas himself deserve curious comparison with Chaucer, Lidgate, & owre best Inglish, auncient & moderne. Amongst which, the Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia, & the Faerie Queene ar now freshest in request: & Astrophil, & Amyntas ar none of the idlest pastimes of sum fine humanists. The Earle of Essex much commendes Albions England: and not unworthily for diverse notable pageants, before, & in the Chronicle. Sum Inglish, & other Histories nowhere more sensibly described, or more inwardly discovered. The Lord Mountjoy makes the like account of Daniels peece of the Chronicle, touching the Usurpation of Henrie of Bullingbrooke. which in deede is a fine, sententious, & politique peece of Poetrie: as proffitable, as pleasurable. The younger sort takes much delight in Shakespeares Venus, & Adonis: but his Lucrece, & his tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke, have it in them, to please the wiser sort. Or such poets: or better: or none.
Vilia miretur vulgus: mihi flavus Apollo Pocula Castaliæ plena ministret aquæ: quoth Sir Edward Dier, betwene jest, & earnest. Whose written devises farr excell most of the sonets, and cantos in print. His Amaryllis, & Sir Walter Raleighs Cynthia, how fine & sweet inventions? Excellent matter of emulation for Spencer, Constable, France, Watson, Daniel, Warner, Chapman, Silvester, Shakespeare, & the rest of owr florishing

metricians. I looke for much, aswell in verse, as in prose, from mie two Oxford frends, Doctor Gager, & M. Hackluit: both rarely furnished for the purpose: & I have a phansie to Owens new Epigrams, as pithie as elegant, as plesant as sharp, & sumtime as weightie as breife: & amongst so manie gentle, noble, & royall spirits meethinkes I see sum heroical thing in the clowdes: mie soveraine hope. Axiophilus shall forgett himself, or will remember to leave sum memorials behinde him: & to make an use of so manie rhapsodies, cantos, hymnes, odes, epigrams, sonets, & discourses, as at idle howers, or at flowing fitts he hath compiled. God knowes what is good for the world, & fitting for this age."

Various works and persons are mentioned, but two especially help to date this passage more precisely than just some time after purchase in 1598. (1) The Earl of Essex is referred to in the present tense. After his rebellion on 8th February 1601, he is unlikely to have been referred to as a source of literary taste, and he would not be referred to in the present tense after 25th February 1601 when he was executed.[4] (2) The Lord Mountjoy was made Earl of Devonshire on 21st July 1603,[5] and would be referred to as the Earl of Devonshire,[6] just as Essex was referred to as the Earl of Essex. Harvey's note was therefore written before 25th February 1601, and probably before 8th February 1601, which means that *Hamlet* was completed before then.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2008e). Hamlet. Hibbard, G. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.4, Shakespeare, William (2003d). Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Edwards, Philip (ed.), Cambridge. p.5. [2] Shakespeare, William (2008e). Hamlet. Hibbard, G. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.4 says "This does not mean, however, that he made all the notes and marginalia it contains in that year; for it has been shown that he sometimes made fresh observations when rereading", citing Kirschbaum, Leo (1937). The Date of Shakespeare's Hamlet. Studies in Philology, 34. pp.168–75. [3] DLB 263, pp.67–90. [4] Shakespeare, William (2008e). Hamlet. Hibbard, G. R. (ed.), Oxford. p.4. [5] Burke, Sir Bernard (1866). A Genealogical History of the Dormant, Abeyant, Forfeited, and Extinct Peerages of the British Empire. p.55. [6] See also Duthie, George Ian (1941). The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet: a Critical Study. pp.80–1 who mentions this whereas the Cambridge, Arden, and Oxford editions do not appear to.

§ Raleigh's *Cynthia* and Dyer's devices, mentioned by Harvey, were circulated in manuscript,[1] as were John Owen's "new epigrams" one of which is dated 1596,[2] which does not help with the earliest date of the comment since this predates the purchase of Speght. Owen's epigrams were printed in 1606,[3] and no earlier edition is

known.[4] The word "new" could mean that the manuscript circulation was new and that the literary circle had not seen the epigrams before, that these were the most recent of Owen's epigrams to be circulated, or that Owen had stopped work on them and had therefore newly completed them as a unit. It is far less likely that Harvey would refer to a very notoriously executed Earl in the present tense on a matter of literary taste, and to a Lord whom he knew in person with the wrong title, than that he read Owen's epigrams in manuscript along with other works that are known to have circulated in manuscript. This is therefore also reasonable evidence for Owen's epigrams having been circulated in manuscript, which is interesting in relation for example to Shakespeare's sonnets having been seen by Meres in 1598 and published only much later, in 1609.

[1] Duthie, George Ian (1941). The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet: a Critical Study. pp.79–80. [2] Duthie, George Ian (1941). The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet: a Critical Study. p.79, citing "Moore Smith, p.309". [3] Owen, John (1606). Epigrammatum Libri Tres. EEBO, STC 18984.5 and 18984.7. [4] "These were first published in 1606", says Duthie, George Ian (1941). The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet: a Critical Study. p.79. This is confirmed by the title page. Shakespeare, William (2005b). Hamlet. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Arden. p.48 is presumably in error, therefore, that the epigrams "were not published until 1607".

§ The reference to a "late innouasion" inhibiting the tragedians of the city from playing may refer to the 22nd June 1600 play company restrictions.[1] This is followed in F1 by a reference to an "ayrie of Children, little / Yases", which refers to one of the play companies composed of child actors.[2] It is not clear which child company was intended; or whether all the child companies were intended; or when the child companies were at their most confrontational with respect to the adult companies; or whether the passage is an excision from Q2 or an addition to Q1 and F1; or even whether Q1 represents the passage in F1. The innovation reference is plausible, but the following eyrie passage is useless for dating *Hamlet*.

Middleton talks about a "nest of boys" at the Blackfriars, where the Children of the Chapel performed, in *Father Hubbard's Tales* (1604).[3] According to Adrian Weiss, this pamphlet's "date of composition coincides with Middleton's pamphlet writing activity during the closing of the theatres in 1603–4."[4] Jenkins points out that it is strange for Hamlet to ask about the estimation of the players, as he does in Q2,

without it being followed up by the story of their estimation falling away.[5] But the estimation question could, from the point of view of the playwright, have just been an introduction for Hamlet to make his comment about the king. Jenkins is more likely to be correct, however, because the case of the child players growing in estimation could be seen to parallel the growing estimation of Hamlet's uncle compared to his father; an act of usurpation.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2005b). Hamlet. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Arden. p.52. [2] Suggested at least as early as Pope, Alexander (1726). The Works of Shakespear. Vol. 7. p.244 and in many works thereafter. [3] Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008b). Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works. p.159 and p.173. [4] Weiss, Adrian (2008). Father's Hubburd's Tales. In: Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.). Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture. p.348. [5] Shakespeare, William (1982a). Hamlet. Jenkins, Harold (ed.), Arden. p.471.

§ The poem *Diaphantus* by "An. Sc.", probably Antony Scoloker, published in 1604, refers to *Hamlet* three times. The first of these references is in the epistle to the general reader, where he complains how difficult it is to write an epistle.[1] He enumerates the qualities required:[2]

"It should be like the *Neuer-too-well read Arcadia*, where the *Prose* and *Verce*, (*Matter* and *Words*) are like his *Mistresses* eyes one still excelling another and without Coriuall: or to come home to the vulgars *Element*, like *Friendly Shake-speares Tragedies*, where the *Commedian* rides, when the *Tragedian* stands on Tip-toe: Faith it should please all, like Prince *Hamlet*. But in sadnesse, then it were to be feared he would runne made Insooth I will not be moonesicke, to please: nor out of my wits though I displeased all".

The other mentions of Hamlet, the character, are in each of two consecutive stanzas in the poem, and are only passing references. Shakespeare is specifically named in the epistle, so there is no doubt here as to whether Shakespeare's play or the ur-Hamlet is referred to. Even without a specific link to Shakespeare, the fact that this *Hamlet* pleases all would have been enough to differentiate it from the source play, which was at least by 1604 considered stale.

The *Diaphantus* epistle goes on to say that "but for the *Lord Mayor*, and the two *Sheriffes*, the Innes of Court, and many Gallants elsewhere, this last yeare might haue bene

burned." Gurr suggests that he is referring here to his poem, specifically, nearly having been burned, and that this danger was a consequence of the Bishops' Ban of 1st June 1599.[3] But the fact that the author invokes various figures who appear to have stepped in to prevent the burning seems to indicate that he is not saying that the work may have been burned if he had written it a year ago. In fact, he does not even say that the poem itself may have been burned, only that the last year might have been burned. It sounds more as though he is saying, figuratively, that the effort that he has spent a year on would have been burned. If that effort was on the present work, and if Gurr's conjecture is right, the work would have been written in the year up to the Bishops' Ban. This seems unlikely since Hamlet is mentioned in the work, and *Hamlet* was not written before June 1599, unless the author is referring to the Hamlet of the source play in the work, and only Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in the preface. This seems unlikely too. In the flow of his argument, it seems more likely that the author is referring to the figures as authorities who keep men honest, as this sentence follows one where he praises virtue. The year may allude to the year of their terms in office. But the epistle is not clear: the author apologises for sounding mystical or tyrannical, attributing it to a humour that he got from tobacco, and the allusiveness of the piece makes extracting dating information difficult.

In a slightly more sober succeeding section of the epistle, the author does also mention "many his deare friends that tooke much paines for it" to be printed, which implies some gap between composition and printing. That this comes after the valediction on the first part of the epistle suggests that the epistle was enlarged when it went to print. Perhaps the joke about the word "element" in *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* alludes to the "vulgars *Element*" in this preface, but if so then Shakespeare would have to have seen the work in manuscript, and the reference would be lost on most or all of the audience, or the reference was added after initial composition; so this might be thought unlikely too—though there is a similar instance elsewhere in the oeuvre, where Shakespeare makes use of the word "amazement" from his manuscript source for *The Tempest*. A small piece appended to *Diaphantus* is entitled the "passionate mans pilgrimage", which may be a nod to the *Passionate Pilgrim* of 1599, largely surreptitiously attributed to Shakespeare. The best that can be said, then, is that

Diaphantus may have been written somewhat before 1604, but that no specific date is evident from current analysis.

[1] Contrary to the argument in Duncan-Jones (2001). Ungentle Shakespeare. p.179, he does not refer to qualities that "a good piece of writing" should have, but specifically to the qualities required of an epistle. This is evident from the reasonable point made in his summary that he will have no epistle, since "it were worse then one of *Hercules* Labours". [2] Sc., An. [Anthony Scoloker?] (1604). Diaphantus. EEBO, STC 21853. Sig. A2r. [3] Gurr's suggestion via Shakespeare, William (2005b). Hamlet. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Arden. p.49.

§ On the basis of the evidence considered cumulatively, *Hamlet* was in moderate probability written after 22nd June 1600 given the reference to the late innovation, assuming that it is not an insertion into a play which was already being performed, and almost certainly written before February 1601 given the date of the Harvey note. The late innovation reference is not the only possible revision. Since Q1 reflects a different state of the play compared to Q2 and F1, the play must have been revised after Q1. Wells and Taylor, after dating the original composition of the play to 1600, say only that Shakespeare "revised it later", without committing to a date for these revisions.[1]

[1] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.681.

1600 — Thomas Morley publishes his *First Book of Ayres*, which includes one of the songs sung in *As You Like It*.

* Morley, Thomas (1600). The First Booke of Ayres. EEBO, STC 18115.5.

1600 — John Bodenham mentions Shakespeare amongst others in his *Epistle to Belvedére, or The Garden of the Muses*.

* EKC F&P2, pp.211–2.

c.1600 — Gabriel Harvey scribbles a note mentioning *Hamlet* and other works of Shakespeare into his 1598 Speght edition of *Chaucer's Workes*.

* Cf. 1600, the writing of *Hamlet*.

c.1600 — Shakespeare is alluded to in a university play, *1 Return from Parnassus*.

* EKC Allusions, p.67.

6th January 1600 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play in front of the Queen at Richmond.

* EKC F&P2, p.322.

3rd February 1600 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play in front of the Queen at Richmond.

* EKC F&P2, p.322.

22nd June 1600 — The Privy Council issue an order restricting the play companies, which may be referred to in Hamlet, Act 2.2.

* Shakespeare, William (2005b). Hamlet. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Arden. p.52.

4th August 1600 — *As You Like It*, *Henry V*, and *Much Ado About Nothing* are entered by James Roberts in the Stationers' Register, to be stayed.

* From a fly-leaf in the Stationers' Register. Facsimile in SS R&I, p.212.

14th August 1600 — *Henry V* is transferred in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.63 / 169, and SS R&I, p.213.

23rd August 1600 — *Much Ado About Nothing* and *2 Henry IV* are entered by Andrew Wise and William Aspley in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.63b / 170, and SS R&I, p.214.

§ On why the Lord Chamberlain's Men were apparently selling their plays, Claire McEachern suggests that either the move to the Globe, or more plausibly the "limitation, on 22 June 1600, of the number of London theatres to two, and restriction of their performances to twice a week", perhaps imposed a "fundraising

exigency."[1] The restriction on the number of theatres would appear to help them, but of course the restriction on the number of performances per week may more than have cancelled out any benefit from the reduction in the number of competitors.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2005g). Much Ado About Nothing. McEachern, Claire Elizabeth (ed.), Arden. p.126.

28th August 1600 — William Hart, Shakespeare's nephew, is baptised.

§ William Hart was the first child of Shakespeare's sister Joan and her husband also named William. Their subsequent children were Mary (b.1603), Thomas (b.1605), and Michael (b.1608). Shakespeare left the three boys five pounds each in his will, Mary having not survived childhood, but apparently only remembered the names of William and Michael.[1] Was Shakespeare godfather to his nephew? If so, it is not necessary that Shakespeare was in Stratford at the time assuming that Halliwell-Phillipps is correct in his observation that godfathering could be performed by proxy.[2]

[1] Eccles, pp.142–3. [2] Halliwell, James Orchard (1848). The Life of William Shakespeare. p.223, and q.v. 16th October 1608.

2nd September 1600 — The Blackfriars theatre is leased to Henry Evans, to be used by the Children of the Chapel players.

[*] Wickham, Glynne (1972). Early English Stages, 1300 to 1660. Vol. 2. p.131. This is especially relevant regarding the eyases comment in *Hamlet*, cf. the writing thereof in 1600, and the Wars of the Theatres which continued through 1601 and the writing of *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* and revisions to *Troilus and Cressida*.

6th October 1600 — Shakespeare is noted in the *Residuum Sussex* accounts as still owing 13s. 4d. of tax to the exchequer.

[*] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.163. Cf. SS CDL, p.222.

8th October 1600 — *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is entered by Thomas Fisher in the Stationers' Register.

[*] Arber 3, p.65b / 174, and SS R&I, p.214.

28th October 1600 — *The Merchant of Venice* is transferred from James Roberts to Thomas Hayes in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.66 / 175, and SS R&I, p.214.

27th December 1600 — Sir Charles Percy mentions Silence and Shallow from the *Merry Wives of Windsor* in a letter.

* Gurr, Andrew (2004a). Playgoing in Shakespeare's London. p.240. Cf. c.1597, the writing of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*.

1601

1601 — *Let the bird of loudest lay* and *Threnos*, a compound poem by Shakespeare, is published as a supplement to Robert Chester's *Love's Martyr*.

* The date}. Borukhov notes one interesting early reader of the poem: William Drummond of Hawthornden, who writes in 1606 of having read it.

§ *Love's Martyr*, by Robert Chester, is a kind of hybrid work which is one measure allegory and one measure poetic encyclopaedia. The allegorical framework starts with the Phoenix mourning an attack by Envy, and Nature rescuing her and taking her to Paphos. On the way they go over England, which is the excuse for the encyclopaedic material including a history of King Arthur. Then follows another encyclopaedic section about various plants, minerals, animals, and so forth. The last of the animals to be mentioned are the birds, and the Phoenix finds a grieving Turtle Dove. The Phoenix takes pity and they consume themselves in the Phoenix' flames. After this, a Pelican gives a brief moral discourse, which is followed by some cantos addressed to the Phoenix by the Paphian Turtle Dove. Then begins a new title page, setting forth *Poetical Essays* on the same subject of the Phoenix and the Turtle Dove, dedicated to Sir John Salusbury. These poems were contributed by other poets, in order: an anonymous poet, Shakespeare, Marston, Chapman, and Jonson.

Chester's work is universally maligned by critics. Thomas Harrison calls it a "strange, confused, and rambling hotchpotch",[1] and this is by no means the most savage description. Some sense of the disconnected nature of the work may be gauged from the fact that even experienced critics have not agreed whether the poetic inventory of plants and so forth describes Britain, as Katherine Duncan-Jones says,[2] or Paphos, as Colin Burrow says.[3] Indeed the setting for the inventory is after a description of the topographical features of Britain, but the inventory of animals includes the leopard, tiger, lion, elephant, dragon, panther, bear, ape, salamander, chameleon, and unicorn. Burrow has a more plausible case than Duncan-Jones on this issue, therefore, but the confusion may be more in Chester than in the scholars.

[1] Harrison, Thomas P. (1966). Review of The Phoenix and the Turtle: Shakespeare's Poem and Chester's Loues Martyr by William H. Matchett. Modern Philology, 64.2, November. p.155. Though Chester's poem is endearing all the same. There are not many poems in which a talking pelican gives a brief moral discourse. [2] Duncan-Jones, Katherine (2001). Ungentle Shakespeare. p.141. [3] Burrow, Colin (ed.) (2002). The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Sonnets and Poems. p.83.

§ Shakespeare's compound poem is usually considered out of context of the *Poetical Essays*, but the essays are clearly intended to be an interwoven sequence. We are perhaps too used to studying Shakespeare as one of the least collaborative of Elizabethan dramatists. This work is different, is quite anomalous, and must be treated so. There are many mysteries raised by the essays. Why did such excellent poets append their essays to a work which is judged to have so little literary merit? Who led this project? What did they intend in their efforts? Such mysteries must be situated within the experience of the contemporary reader, especially in order to understand the intention of the efforts. A summary, therefore, of the *Poetical Essays* on as descriptive a basis as possible will help to illuminate some of their substance from within.

The essays begin with two poems by the Chorus of Poets. These two poems can be thought of as collaborations or spokespieces of the poets involved in writing the essays. The first is an invocation to the thespian deities which commends the following poems to the gods of poetry, and asks them for instructions about how to quench their thirsty muse. This poem also characterises the effort in whole as a congratulation for an "honorable friend", meaning Salusbury, to whom the whole sequence is dedicated on the inter-title page. This is reinforced by the second poem by the Chorus of Poets, which is entitled or dedicated *To the worthily honor'd Knight Sir Iohn Salisburie*. As well as developing the theme of the invocation, this sequel informs Salusbury, as the noblest of minds, that the poets have properly obtained the pure juice of inspiration that flows from the Pierian spring. The poets argue that they are not writing these poems out of mere servitude, but out of true zeal. The dedicatory poem then closes with a characterisation of the poems as "an *Inuention*, freer then the *Times*".

The first two poems of the sequence proper are by an unknown author who is deliberately styled Ignoto, and are entitled *The first* and *The burning*. The title of the first

poem may, if authorial, mean that the poet knew his work was intended to be the first of the collection. It compares the Phoenix to other things which are unique in their settings, such as the sun in the daytime sky, concluding however that the Phoenix is only unique until reborn. The second poem describes the Phoenix' immolation, and describes especially how the act of the burning of the first Phoenix feeds the life of the second Phoenix.

Then follow Shakespeare's poems, *Let the bird*, named here from its incipit as it goes untitled in the work itself, and the accompanying *Threnos*. Summarising these pieces adequately is one of the more difficult endeavours in which an historian of literature has to engage. The first piece opens with the anonymised Phoenix playing herald to its own funeral, calling chaste birds to join in the mourning and to keep away the screech owl and all tyrannical birds with the exception of the Eagle, which may represent rightful authority. The Swan as priest is to perform a requiem, and the Crow is enjoined metaphysically to join in amongst the mourners. Next there is a commendatory anthem which celebrates the love and constancy of the Phoenix and the Turtle Dove, this being the first time in the *Poetical Essays* that the Turtle Dove is mentioned. Shakespeare praises their love in strongly metaphysical terms across four stanzas which concentrate on the tension between the singleness of a partnership and its cardinal duality. Then follows a kind of miniature masterpiece masque across a further four stanzas, the main players being Property, Nature, Reason, Division, and Love. The main character, Reason, comes across as being confounded that the qualities are not to be found in itself, but only in Love. As a result, Reason is said to make the following *Threnos* to the Phoenix and the Turtle Dove as a chorus to their tragic scene. The *Threnos* repeats the theme of the preceding poem as an elegy or lamentation of the Phoenix and Turtle Dove, saying that Beauty, Truth, and Rarity perished with the Phoenix and Turtle Dove, that they leave no posterity (of their qualities, or of instant rebirth) because they were chaste in marriage. The *Threnos* then closes with an invitation to those who are truthful or beautiful to visit the burial place, using the same word "urn" that is also used in *The burning* for this, and to "sigh a prayer" for the dead birds.

Marston's following poem, *A narration and description of a most exact and wondrous creature, arising out of the Phœnix and Turtle Doues ashes*, follows directly from the action of Shakespeare's compound poem: it opens with a quick praise, in character, of Shakespeare's preceding Epicedium. Perhaps what Shakespeare meant in the poem by leaving "no posterity" therefore is that the Phoenix and Turtle Dove's unique characteristics at least are lost; or perhaps that Marston's creature has simply not been born out of the ashes yet. Marston's creature is even now not directly described in this, his first poem, but only described as a metaphysical strangeness. The reader then turns the page to find *The description of this Perfection*, which is however just as elusive. The description does not reveal the perfection, but prepares to laud it, characterising it as a kind of sponge that can soak up any flattery given to it and never yet be full, as though it were some sort of inverse cornucopia. Then follows a sonnet, *To Perfection*, which starts the lauding proper. Marston submits that Nature has made so much which is imperfect in order to store all of its perfection in this one great creature. The last of Marston's poems is a Hymn of Perfection, which essentially gives up trying to define the now mature creature at all, and says that it is beyond all describing. The fact that the creature is now mature in this final poem shows that it has been born and grown in Marston's verse, without ever explicitly being delineated in terms that render it sensible to the reader.

Chapman's poem, *Peristeros: or the male Turtle*, comes as both an anticlimax and a surprise. Instead of continuing the lofty theme started by the Chorus of Poets, Ignoto, Shakespeare, and Marston, Chapman opens with a simple antithesis based on the inconstancy of most lovers, contrasting that with the pure love between the Turtle Dove and the Phoenix. It is as though he is elucidating Shakespeare's anthem. This is the anticlimax. But the closing couplet performs a twist, in that Chapman brings himself into the action, saying that he is devoted to the Phoenix, and that he cannot move from her, that she sustains him and gives his being spirit. This is the surprise, because rather than keeping the Phoenix and Turtle Dove as a remote allegory, the poet brings himself into the allegory, or reveals that the Phoenix is relevant to him. This is the conclusion of his poem, and like Marston he ends in much the same manner that he starts, teasing the reader with a single concept which he then fails to elucidate.

Ben Jonson contributes four poems. The first is a *Prelude* which is based on an extremely surprising premise. Contrary to the invocation by the Chorus of Poets, Jonson rejects all help from the gods and muses. Rather, he says, he brings his own true fire, and will sing an epode to deep ears, to those who are receptive enough to understand his meaning. The *Epos* is a complex allegory of virtue contrasting false love with true love, and proposes that the true love can be personated by one like the Turtle Dove, who itself can chastely die. This can be enabled only by the Phoenix' love. There is much in Jonson's poem which echoes that of Shakespeare's, such as Reason being struck blind, and the discussion of the essence of true love, with love being a pivotal word in *Let the bird*. The fact that true love can be personated by one like the Turtle Dove brings about a strange triality to Jonson's poem. There is the general allegory of the mind and of virtue, and of love. There is the relationship to the Turtle Dove and the Phoenix. And there is at last the hint of an anthropic link, with Jonson mentioning a *dame* of this excelling frame, referring to the Phoenix but using terms habitual to humans. Indeed the last sentence of the poem warns that man (not bird) may securely sin, but never safely. This is followed by a kind of key to the preceding piece, called *The Phoenix Analysde*, where Jonson tells the reader not to be surprised if a bird should turn into a woman, and not to think that this is mere fable. In very mysterious terms he also enjoins the reader against reading from his, or perhaps the Chorus of Poets', prophecy of the Turtle Dove that Nature's fairest creature should be a mere type and figure of the Phoenix, his mistress. He then closes with a very straightforward *Enthusiastic Ode* in praise of the Phoenix, whom he calls a lady.

§ Burrow suggests that the essays were orchestrated by Jonson,[1] but this is unlikely for two reasons. The first is that Jonson's preface contradicts the preface by the authoritative Chorus of Poets. The second is that Jonson has used a poem which was quoted in 1601, and which he reused at least twice thereafter, so he seems not to have concentrated much on this project, and only dressed up some other material which he was nonetheless proud of. The best argument for Jonson orchestrating the project is that early manuscript drafts of his *Proludium* and *Epode* are found amongst other poems of his in the Salusbury papers. Duncan-Jones suggests Marston as the orchestrator,[2] who was a Middle Templar like Sir John Salusbury. My guess is that the

Chorus of Poets spokesman is Marston too. Marston shows the most clear progressive understanding of the project in his own poems. He probably had difficulty enticing Jonson, who once claimed to have beaten Marston and stolen his pistol,[3] into the project. Jonson gave him some reworked material and a very independent preface, but apparently Marston could not, or at least did not, refuse the offer. Chapman's poem was only adequate, whereas Shakespeare gave him masterpieces, and he acknowledges this strongly in his first line. The only room for doubt over the identification of Marston as the orchestrator is the presence of Ignoto. Without guessing the identity of Ignoto, it is reasonable to suspect anyway that this person was someone connected to the other poets with moderate closeness. The fact that Ignoto's contributions are short and not very developmental, however, and that the poesy does not seem to match the composed vigour of the Chorus of Poets introductions, indicates that they probably played only a small part in the essays.

[1] Burrow, Colin (ed.) (2002). The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Sonnets and Poems. p.88. [2] Duncan-Jones, Katherine (2001). Ungentle Shakespeare. p.143. [3] Laing, David (ed.) (1842). Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden. p.20, Cathcart, Charles (2008). Marston, Rivalry, Rapprochement, and Jonson. p.150.

1601 — *Troilus and Cressida* is revised, and probably performed for the first time.

§ In June 1601, the War of the Theatres started, with Jonson pitting his wits against Marston and Dekker.[1] In the same year, Jonson and Marston collaborated on the *Poetical Essays*, so if the quarrel was real then perhaps those essays came earlier in the year, and the war afterwards. Jonson is recorded as having said that he once beat Marston and stole his pistol,[2] though whether that was in this year or not is unknown. Certainly it helps to illustrate the relationship between them. Jonson's main salvo in the War was the *Poetaster*, which contains a prologue who enters and says:

If any muse why I salute the Stage,
An armed *Prologue*; know, 'tis a dangerous Age:
Wherein, who writes, had need present his *Scenes*
Forty-fold proof against the conjuring means
Of base Detractors, and illiterate Apes[3].

This is referred to in Shakespeare's prologue to *Troilus and Cressida*:[4]

Now Expectation tickling skittish spirits,
On one and other side, Troian and Greeke,
Sets all on hazard. And hither am I come,
A Prologue arm'd, but not in confidence
Of Authors pen, or Actors voyce; but suited
In like conditions, as our Argument[4].

Jonson issued an *Apologetical Dialogue* in December 1601 which quelled the War of the Theatres, and the reference to the armed prologue would have been most relevant between June and December 1601.[5] As the prologue forms part of a number of additions to *Troilus and Cressida*, some of which refer to the War of the Theatres, the play was most likely revised between June and December 1601.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1998e). Troilus and Cressida. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Arden. p.7. [2] Laing, David (ed.) (1842). Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden. p.20, Cathcart, Charles (2008). Marston, Rivalry, Rapprochement, and Jonson. p.150. [3] Jonson, Ben (1616). The workes of Beniamin Ionson. EEBO, STC 14752. p.277. [4] Shakespeare, William (1998e). Troilus and Cressida. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Arden. p.10. Shakespeare, William (2008s). Troilus and Cressida. Muir, Kenneth (ed.), Oxford. p.5, too, says there is "little doubt" about this reference. [5] Kimbrough, Robert (1962). The Origins of Troilus and Cressida. The Publications of the Modern Language Association, 77.3. p.196. [6] Ioppolo, Grace (1991). Revising Shakespeare. pp.152–4.

§ The *Family of Love* parodies *Troilus and Cressida*. Kimbrough holds that it was written in about 1602 by Thomas Middleton.[1] Cathcart, more recently, argues that the play was written between 1602 and May 1605,[2] and that the parts referring to Shakespeare are more likely to be by Marston.[3]

[1] Kimbrough, Robert (1962). The Origins of Troilus and Cressida. The Publications of the Modern Language Association, 77.3. pp.195–6. [2] Cathcart, Charles (2008). Marston, Rivalry, Rapprochement, and Jonson. p.129–30. [3] Cathcart, Charles (2008). Marston, Rivalry, Rapprochement, and Jonson. p.137.

§ A poet identifying himself as "I.C.", probably Joseph Cresswell, the Jesuit rector of the English college in Rome,[1] was working on a poem for some friends in late 1602:

"This smale poeme (Gentle Reader) was composed for the pleasure of some priuate freinds, and intended to haue bin presented for a Newe-yeres gift the first of this mounth: But interuention of other affaires, delaied the finishing therof, vntill the last. [...] Farewell this last of Ianuarie. 1603. / Thyne I. C."[2] At the beginning of the poem, he makes a clear reference to the stories of Troilus and Cressida, Richard III, and the rape of Lucrece, the conjunction of which strongly indicates that the author is referring to the works of Shakespeare.

Of *Helens* rape, and *Troyes* beseiged *Towne*,
Of *Troylus* faith, and *Cressids* falsitie,
Of *Rychards* stratagems for the english crowne,
Of *Tarquins* lust, and lucrece chastitie,
Of these, of none of these my muse nowe treates,
Of greater conquests, warres, and loues she speakes[3].

[1] Chambrun, Clara Longworth (1957). Shakespeare: a Portrait Restored. p.192. [2] I. C. [Cresswell, Joseph?] (1603). Saint Marie Magdalens Conuersion. EEBO, STC 4282. Sig. A1v. [3] I. C. [Cresswell, Joseph?] (1603). Saint Marie Magdalens Conuersion. EEBO, STC 4282. Sig. A3r.

§ On 7th February 1603, *Troilus and Cressida* was entered to James Roberts by a full court of those responsible for the entry. A full court means that much consideration was paid to the entry, and in the event the entry was only conditional: "to print when he hath gotten sufficient aucthority for yt. The booke of Troilus and Cresseda as yt is acted by my lo: Chamb[er]lens Men." No copy of *Troilus and Cressida* by James Roberts is known. It was entered in the Stationers' Register again on 28th January 1609 and printed in that year.[1]

[1] All from Chambrun, Clara Longworth (1957). Shakespeare: a Portrait Restored. p.194. Stationers' Register entry in Arber 3, p.178b / 400.

c.1601 — *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* is written.

§ The date of *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* must be untangled from three pieces of dating evidence. The first is the visit to London by the Duke of Bracciano, Virginio Orcini, to whose name the Duke Orsino in the play almost certainly refers.[1] He visited

from 4th January 1601 to 11th January, which included a sumptuous entertainment with the Queen at Whitehall on twelfth night, 6th January.[2] The second piece of evidence is that John Marston, with whom Shakespeare collaborated on the *Poetical Essays* in the same year, wrote a play in 1601 called *What You Will*, with themes similar to Shakespeare's play.[3] The third is the first notice of a performance of the play, by John Manningham in his diary for 2nd February 1602.[4]

[1] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.719. They date the play as most probably written during 1601 on this basis. [2] Wyatt, Michael (2005). The Italian Encounter with Tudor England. pp.131–3. [3] Geckle, George L. (1980). John Marston's Drama. p.93. [4] Smith, Bruce R. (2001). Twelfth Night: Texts and Contexts. p.2. Interestingly, Manningham had first written "Mid" before crossing it out and putting "Twelve Night, or What You Will".

§ On twelfth night 1601, the Duke Orsini is said to have seen, in the company of Queen Elizabeth, a "comedy mixed with music and dance". This might have been an early version of *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* as we know it, perhaps originally titled simply *What You Will*. But this cannot have been written for the Duke, because the visit was said to have been at first quite secret. Bishop Godfrey Goodman, chaplain to Queen Anne the consort of James I, wrote a large work about the court of James, but mentions a story about Queen Elizabeth and Orsini too:

"Duke Prusiano, a very courteous and brave nobleman, did resolve to come over to see England, and to come in a private way. Our ambassador in France, hearing thereof, gave notice to our secretary, who acquainting her majesty therewith, order was taken that one should come in his company, to be a spy upon him, to know his lodgings and to discover his person. The duke (as the fashion was) came to the court upon a Sunday, to see the Queen go to the chapel. The Queen having notice of this, and knowing him by one that stood next to him, as she came by took some occasion to call the lord chamberlain, as I take it, to tie her shoe-strings, or to do some such like office; and there making a stay, she took the duke by the hand who followed her into the privy chamber."[1]

Goodman may be wrong in at least one of the particulars of this story, as Michael Wyatt notes in his 2005 work that Orsini did not have a private meeting with

Elizabeth until later in the week, and does not mention a Sunday meeting. But as well as this evidence, Wyatt points out that "had the male protagonist of this entertainment staged in Orsini's presence actually borne his name, we might reasonably suppose that there would be some mention of such a gesture in the correspondence otherwise so filled with details of the attention this Italian visitor attracted in England."[2] The visit by the duke was big news, anyway, once it was known. There are, then, two possibilities: either the play was written before the visit of Orsini, and the name of the play and one of the leading characters changed to reflect the duke's visit. Or, the play was written after the visit, and refers only to the event in terms of the inspiration.

[1] Goodman, Godfrey (1839). The Court of King James the First. p.17. [2] Wyatt, Michael (2005). The Italian Encounter with Tudor England. p.133.

§ If *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* was written before the visit of Duke Orsini, then it would seem more likely than not that this was the play performed for the duke. Otherwise, why change the play to reflect at least the duke's name, and probably the prime court occasion of his visit too? In this case, Marston may have simply based his play on that by Shakespeare, and used the name from which it had been changed. Manningham calls the play *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* in his diary, so it had both names by early 1602. If the play was written solely after Orsini's visit, perhaps inspired mainly by the visit, then Shakespeare and Marston may have been working on a play of the same name at the same time, with Marston somehow forcing Shakespeare to change the name, perhaps because Marston finished his play first. There are similarities of theme between the two plays, as well as simply the parallel of the name.[1] It is possible that Shakespeare wrote the play for twelfth night of 1602 deliberately trying to evoke memories of the previous year's twelfth night by including the character of the duke.

Whether *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* was written in late 1600 and revised, or written during some part of 1601 as is more likely, it is clear that these finishing touches at least, of title and character, were put in place in 1601, and that the play was still being performed at important venues in early 1602.

[1] Geckle, George L. (1980). John Marston's Drama. p.93.

c.1601 — 2 *Return from Parnassus*, which lampoons, amongst others, Shakespeare, Burbage, and Kemp, is written.

* Bate, Jonathan (2008). Soul of the Age. p.377 says it was "produced at St John's College during the Christmas vacation 1601–02".

7th February 1601 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men are paid to play *Richard II* and a *Henry IV* play, both of which depict deposed kings, on the eve of an attempted revolt by the Earl of Essex.

* EKC F&P2, pp.323–26.

8th February 1601 — Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, revolts against the Queen, but the revolt does not succeed and Essex is later executed.

* Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (2003). A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Vol. 2. The Histories. pp.57–60 has a good summary.

18th February 1601 — Augustine Phillips of the Lord Chamberlain's Men, and one of his unnamed players, are interrogated about their part in the Earl of Essex revolt.

* EKC F&P2, p.325.

19th February 1601 — The Earls of Essex and Southampton are sentenced to death, though Southampton would be eventually released.

* Rice, Douglas Walthew (2005). The Life and Achievements of Sir John Popham, 1531–1607. pp.147–8 has a good summary.

24th February 1601 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men perform before the Queen.

* EKC F&P2, p.323, and EKC ES 2, p.205. Rice, Douglas Walthew (2005). The Life and Achievements of Sir John Popham, 1531–1607. p.148 cites "Chambers, vol. 2, p.206", i.e. EKC ES 2, p.206, on this matter but the exact date is not given there, though it is certainly discussed there. "Most scholars accept that Shakespeare's company performed his Richard II that day", according to Hammer, Paul E. J. (2008). Shakespeare's Richard II, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising. Shakespeare Quarterly 59.1. p.3.

§ It is interesting that so soon after their alleged implication in the Essex scandal they performed in front of the Queen, just six days after Augustine Phillips and another of the Lord Chamberlain's Men were interrogated. They are unlikely to have performed *Richard II* on this occasion. Either their defence was considered reasonable or they were forgiven with some ease. Their defence was that they played *Richard II* because they were paid so much over the usual takings for it, and that they would not have performed it otherwise. Were they interrogated about whether they thought it unusual to be paid for the performance of a stale play? Perhaps, socially speaking, they were under considerable duress.

25th February 1601 — The Earl of Essex is executed.

[*] Rice, Douglas Walthew (2005). The Life and Achievements of Sir John Popham, 1531–1607. p.148.

25th March 1601 — Thomas Whittington of Shottery leaves in his will the 40s owed to him by Anne Shakespeare, William's wife, to the poor people of Stratford.

§ Thomas Whittington is said to be the shepherd of Anne's father, Richard Hathaway, in Richard's will, and Thomas describes himself as a husbandman in his own will.[1] Richard had bequeathed Thomas £4 6s 8d. Thomas had not only bequeathed the 40s (or £2) but also a separate sum of £3 to the poor. John and William Hathaway, Anne's brothers according to Halliday, owed Thomas £6, but he also owed them for a quarter of a year's board.[2] He was currently living with John Pace in Shottery. The item is the first non-boilerplate one in the will:

"Item I geve and bequeth unto the poore people of Stratford 40^{s}. that is in the hand of Anne Shaxspere, wyf unto M^{r} Wyllyam Shaxspere, and is due debt unto me, beyng payd to myne Executor by the sayd Wyllyam Shaxspere or his assigns, accordyng to the true meanyng of this my wyll ..."[3]

[1] Facsimile of the will in SS DL, p.68. Cf. HP O2, p.196 for Richard Hathaway's will, and Society of Antiquaries (1847). Archaeologia. Vol. 32. p.445 for a full copy of Thomas Whittington's. [2] Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.698, and EKC F&P2, p.42 for the schedule of debts. [3] Society of Antiquaries (1847). Archaeologia. Vol. 32. p.445

§ Why did Anne owe Thomas the money? Katherine Duncan-Jones believes that there is a straightforward implication that Anne had to turn to Thomas in a time of hardship with William away.[1] This is the pessimistic version of what may be the earliest suggestion in connection with the debt, by Collier: that it had "been borrowed by his wife, probably to supply some temporary emergency at a period when she could not conveniently apply to her husband".[2] An alternative theory sometimes proffered is that Thomas was banking the money with Anne. Tucker Brooke calls the hardship theory sentimental, and suggests that it is equally likely to be for safe keeping or to represent a "promised gratuity or uncollected wages".[3] Halliday says that it was "customary for servants to bank with their masters", and Honan says that he was merely trusting her "to hold in safekeeping for him" the money intended for the poor.[4] Duncan-Jones does not mention the safekeeping theory, and neither Halliday nor Honan mention the hardship theory.

Honan at least is probably wrong: since Thomas also left £3 in a separate sum to the poor of Stratford, and indeed another smaller sum to the poor of nearby Welcombe, why would he save £2 of the £5 overall with Anne? The pessimistic Duncan-Jones, or the optimistic Collier, may be right, but there are also other possible explanations such as a delayed debt from some purchase. One note which bears upon the problem is an anonymous comment on this bequest in Harper's Magazine, which says that "Old legal forms of bequests similar to this indicate that such dispositions were made of small sums where payment was never expected, or had been often refused."[5] Though this is not backed by specific evidence, it is a plausible enough case, though it may be judged peculiar that £2 in total would not be expected, or was refused, considering Shakespeare's considerable wealth.

According to a recent study of Elizabethan prices, 40s or £2 was enough to purchase a couple of good working horses, and it was a year's wages for a poor yeoman.[6] Those things are probably a better indicator of the size of the sum than, for example, that it was enough to purchase 2lb of sugar or a Bible: sugar was back then a very expensive commodity, and large books were rare and valuable, so current views of their financial value are misleading. John Shakespeare once sold a staggering £21 of wool to someone on a pay-on-demand basis, and was not in fact paid, so he had to file a

lawsuit.[7] Perhaps a similar thing had taken place with Thomas selling something to Anne?

Brooke and Halliday may still be right that Thomas had banked with his master, and perhaps even Honan if the separate £3 that Thomas bequeathed to the poor was from his estate rather than loose money that he had at home. On balance, though, this seems less likely than the notion that Anne simply had to borrow the money for some reason, or that she had incurred a longstanding debt with Thomas. There may of course be other explanations too, and it would be unwise to turn any one of these suppositions into an assumption without further direct evidence. It should also be noted that the debt was required to be paid by "the sayd Wyllyam Shaxspere or his assigns", rather than his wife.

[1] Duncan-Jones, Katherine (2001). Ungentle Shakespeare. p.150. [2] Collier, John Payne (1844). The new Fact regarding Shakespeare and his Wife, contained in the Will of Thomas Whittington. The Shakespeare Society's Papers, Vol. 3. p.127. [3] Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. p.37. [4] Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.698 and Honan, p.79. [5] Anon [Conway, M. D.] (1864). Mr. William Shakespeare, At Home. Harper's New Monthly Magazine, 29.171. p.339. [6] Singman, Jeffrey L. (1995). Daily Life in Elizabethan England. p.36. [7] Q.v. 4th November 1568.

4th August 1601 — Queen Elizabeth mentions that *Richard II* has been played forty times.

[*] EKC F&P2, pp.326–7. "This exchange has been very widely cited, often in connection with the play performed on 7 February, in order to suggest that Elizabeth saw herself figured through the lens of the play and believed that this same play was repeatedly performed in the streets as a kind of street theater. Although frequently repeated, this interpretation seems highly implausible", notes Hammer, Paul E. J. (2008). Shakespeare's Richard II, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising. Shakespeare Quarterly 59.1. p.24. Scott-Warren, Jason (2013). Was Elizabeth I Richard II?: The Authenticity of Lambarde's 'Conversation'. Review of English Studies, 64.264. pp.208–30 at least confirms the authenticity of the exchange.

8th September 1601 — John Shakespeare, William's father, is buried in Stratford.

[*] Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.40. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.4.

7th October 1601 — Sir Nicholas Brend mortgages the Globe to his stepbrother John Bodley.

* Braines, William Westmoreland (1924). The Site of the Globe Playhouse Southwark. p.27, citing the "Close Roll, 1722".

10th October 1601 — Bodley's control over the Globe is increased, probably due to the illness of the site owner Sir Nicholas Brend who dies two days later.

§ Sir Nicholas Brend also made his will on this day, and one of his overseers was John Bodley.[1]

[1] Surrey Archæological Society (1891). Surrey Archæological Collections. Vol. 10. p.302.

1602

c.1602 — *Othello* is completed.

§ Shakespeare was indebted to Philemon Holland's translation of Pliny,[1] which contains an epistle to the reader dated "Iunij xij. 1601", i.e. 12th June 1601, and was printed with a title page bearing the date 1601.[2] Shakespeare may have also used *The History of the Turks* by Richard Knolles, which Wells and Taylor note was published "no earlier" than 30th September 1603.[3] On the other hand, Michael Neill notes that "the parallels between the two texts are not sufficiently precise or extensive to put Shakespeare's use of Knolles beyond dispute".[4] Shakespeare later made revisions to *Othello*: Q1 (1622) represents an earlier phase, and F1 (1623) contains the revisions.[5] The use of the *The History of the Turks*, however, is present in both Q1 and F1.

[1] Muir, Kenneth (1953). Holland's Pliny and Othello. Notes and Queries, Vol. 198. pp.513–4. [2] Holland, Philemon (tr.) (1601). The Historie of the World. EEBO, STC 20029. Epistle to the reader, British Library. Honigmann, E. A. J. (1993). The First Quarto of Hamlet and the Date of Othello. Review of English Studies, New Series, 44.174. p.216 also makes this point. [3] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.873. [4] Shakespeare, William (2008k). Othello: The Moor of Venice. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.401. [5] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.873. The revisions themselves are undateable.

§ Building on the early 20th century work of Hart, Honigmann wrote in 1993 that he had found many parallels or correspondences between Q1 (1603) of *Hamlet*, and *Othello*. Honigmann believed that the entry of *Hamlet* into the Stationers' Register of 26th July 1602 by James Roberts was due to his either owning a bad text of the play, or blocking a bad text from being printed.[1] He continued to adhere to this view, and even went on to state more precisely that Shakespeare was finishing *Othello* in early 1602.[2] The basis for this estimate is probably the list of topical events from 1601 that he compiled which he thinks inspired Shakespeare to write the play.[3] The parallels that he presents between Q1 (1603) of *Hamlet* and *Othello* are more convincing than the Stationers' Register argument. Parallels between variants in a reported text and a play, if genuine, are extremely likely to place the play before the report. The only alternative scenario is that an early state of *Hamlet*, corresponding with its Q1,

contained material which Shakespeare later removed from that play and transferred to *Othello* instead. This stretches the bounds of credulity further than the possibility that Shakespeare either did not use *The History of the Turks* and that the parallel there is coincidental; that he saw *The History of the Turks* in print; or that he inserted the potential parallel to that work after original composition. Honigmann also argued that the casting requirements of *Othello* resemble those of *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* (written in c.1601), in that both plays originally contained songs, sung by Desdemona and Viola respectively, which were originally written for a good singer—songs that were later cut or transferred, presumably when the boy actor's voice broke.[4] *Othello* was therefore most likely written in around 1602.

[1] Arber 3, p.84b / 212, and Honigmann, E. A. J. (1993). The First Quarto of Hamlet and the Date of Othello. Review of English Studies, New Series, 44.174. p.216. [2] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1996). The Texts of Othello and Shakespearian Revision. p.39. [3] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1993). The First Quarto of Hamlet and the Date of Othello. Review of English Studies, New Series, 44.174. p.217. [4] An assessment which Shakespeare, William (2008k). Othello: The Moor of Venice. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.401 also finds plausible.

§ The swearing in Q1 (1622) of *Othello* is not present in F1 (1623), which has been suggested as being due to the 1606 Act of Parliament against swearing.[1] McMillin has shown that adherence to the act, however, was inconsistent and based on context.[2] Despite this, there is no more reasonable explanation for the removal of the swearing in the play than the Act of Parliament.

[1] Bhattacharyya, Jibesh (2006). William Shakespeare's Othello. p.75. This ignores the argument of Shakespeare, William (2001d). The First Quarto of Othello. McMillin, Scott (ed.), Cambridge. p.44. [2] Shakespeare, William (2001d). The First Quarto of Othello. McMillin, Scott (ed.), Cambridge. p.44.

18th January 1602 — *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is entered by John Busby into the Stationers' Register.

[*] Arber 3, p.78 / 199, and SS R&I, p.214.

2nd February 1602 — John Manningham records a performance of *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*.

§ "at our feast wee had a play called [d. ..] Twelue night or what you will much like the comedy of Errores or Menechmi in plautus but most like and neere to that in Italian called Inganni a good practice in it to make the steward beleeue his Lady widdowe was in Loue wth him. by counterfeyting a letter as from his lady in generall termes telling him what shee liked best in him and prescribing his gesture in smiling his apparaile etc. and then when he came to practise making him belieue they tooke him to be mad etc /"[1]

[1] Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. p.1966; facsimile in SS DL, p.156. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.327–8.

13th March 1602 — John Manningham records an anecdote about Shakespeare and Richard Burbage.

§ Manningham was a student at the Middle Temple in 1602, and jotted down this anecdote about Shakespeare in his diary, on the authority of his roommate Edward Curle:[1]

"Vpon a tyme when Burbidge played Rich. 3. there was a citizen greue soe farr in liking wth him, that before shee went from the play shee appointed him to come that night vnto hir by the name of Ri: the 3. Shakespeare ouerhearing their conclusion, went before, was intertained, and at his game ere Burbidge came. Then message being brought that Rich. the 3^{d}. was at the dore, Shakespeare caused returne to be made that William the Conquerour was before Rich. the 3. Shakespeares name w[i]ll[ia]m m^{r} *Curle* /"[2]

[1] SS CDL, p.205. [2] Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). The Riverside Shakespeare. 2nd edition, Vol. 1. p.1960, citing Harley MS 5353, British Museum. f.29v. Facsimile in SS DL, p.152.

§ Though the Manningham version of the anecdote was first printed by Collier in 1831, the anecdote itself was related many years before. Schoenbaum records a version of it in Wilkes's 1759 book of the stage:[1]

"One evening when Richard III. was to be performed, Shakespear observed a young woman delivering a message to Burbage in so cautious a manner as excited his curiosity to listen to. It imported, that her master was gone out of town that morning, and her mistress would be glad of his company after Play; and to know what signal he would appoint for admittance. Burbage replied, three taps at the door, and it is I, Richard the Third. She immediately withdrew, and Shakespeare followed 'till he observed her to go into a house in the city; and enquiring in the neighbourhood, he was informed that a young lady lived there, the favourite of an old rich merchant. Near the appointed time of meeting, Shakespear thought proper to anticipate Mr. Burbage, and was introduced by the concerted signal. The lady was very much surprised at Shakespear's presuming to act Mr. Burbage's part; but as he (who had wrote Romeo and Juliet) we may be certain did not want wit or eloquence to apologize for the intrusion, she was soon pacified, and they were mutually happy till Burbage came to the door, and repeated the same signal; but Shakespear popping his head out the window, bid him be gone; for that William the Conqueror had reigned before Richard III."[2]

[1] Wilkes, Thomas (1759). A General View of the Stage. pp.220–1, via Schoenbaum. [2] SS CDL, pp.205–6.

§ The source of Wilkes's version of the anecdote is unclear. The diary is Harley MS 5353, and the Harleian manuscripts were purchased by parliament for the British Museum in 1753. Wilkes may therefore have consulted the manuscript in the British Library, and the divergent readings would therefore be of his own invention. There is also the possibility, though less likely, that he had a separate line of transmission. In either case, it is possible to imagine a hypothetical scenario where the only surviving evidence for the anecdote is Wilkes: the diary could have gone missing after Wilkes consulted it, or could have gone missing before it reached the attention of Collier. If that had been the case, how many scholars would have been willing to say that the Wilkes story could be for the most part a genuine contemporary story? That the diary could have been destroyed or gone missing is no great stretch of the imagination, and yet this represents at least one case where a contemporary story about Shakespeare went for 157 years without any other known interim documentary echo or commentary.

A consequence of this is that it is broadly impossible to rule out similar jests printed in the 1750s, and perhaps even later, as being late fabrications. This is not to say that the original Manningham story is an accurate story in itself—the story may have been fabricated or embellished to some degree in Shakespeare's age, but it is at least contemporary with Shakespeare. Nor does it mean that stories cannot be ruled out on the basis of internal evidence, as has been attempted with the deer poaching episode.[1] But in the absence of internal evidence, a late date alone does not conclusively rule against a datum as being a genuine transmission from the Elizabethan period.

[1] Cf. c.1590, the start of Shakespeare's career as a prominent individual playwright.

§ Manningham's entry uses the phrase "at his game" to describe Shakespeare's activities at the lady's house. In the later report, which seems to have been embellished but may contain original features of independent derivation, the poet and the lady are "mutually happy". In the older entry the young lady "greue soe farr in liking" with Burbage that she wanted him to come to her, and in the later rendering it is her mistress who would "be glad of his company", which in both instances has sexual overtones. But did Shakespeare go there to conquer her sexually, or to conquer and thereby thwart Burbage's passions?

The phrase "mutually happy" is demure and neutral enough only possibly to warrant a sexual conclusion, but "at his game" in the older report deserves closer attention. The *Oxford English Dictionary* has a phrasal entry for "at game" which is defined as "at play; engaged in some amusement or pastime, esp. gambling", and there are several plausible senses for "game" itself including "That which is being pursued in the course of hunting or the chase; a quarry" (as a metaphor) and "Lovemaking; amorous sport or dalliance".[1] A survey of 16th and 17th century works shows the phrase "at his game" specifically, which is not covered by the OED, to be used in three distinct ways:—

(a) To refer to the act of hunting deer, or other animals:

Walter Tyrel at his game in that wood
Shotyng at a dere, of whiche he drewe no bloode.

(Hardyng, 1543)[2]

"But in the same forrest, being at his game, in the very place (as some say) where one of the Kirks stood, was slaine by an arrow, shot at a Deere".

(Pont, 1599)[3]

Like Hawk, or Buzzard at his game,
This King could fly in th'ayre (sayes fame).

(Gower, 1635)[4]

(b) As an ambiguous metaphor for general custom, or love:

Willye, I wene thou bee assott:
For lustie Loue still sleepeth not,
But is abroad at his game.

(Spenser, 1579)[5]

(c) Referring to general custom or leisure:

"but also otherwhiles, when he was at his game and play, as it fell out, when he dranke and eat, when he was in warfare or in the campe with some, bargaining, buying and selling with others".

(tr. Holland, 1603)[6]

There is also a use in Taylor which is ambiguous:

"for in these dayes men are seldome wearied with swearing, as I haue read of an Italian, that at his game was tyred in that kind, who commanded his man to helpe him to sweare, till he himselfe had gathered his breath againe."

(Taylor, 1630)[7]

It seems that there is nothing inherent in the general use of "at his game" to imply any sexual practice—it would have been a different case had half of the uses referred to romantic affairs—though the reading for "at game" in that sense the OED partly suggests otherwise. Of course, the reading of "at his game" as meaning a general custom may be read sexually anyway if it were widely known that Shakespeare were particularly lustful, but the fact that Manningham chooses to explain (hilariously to the modern ear) that Shakespeare's first name is William would indicate that he did not have this level of familiarity with the subject in mind.

As to Burbage's behaviour, it may be worth noting that *Richard III* was written in c.1592, and though Burbage was married by the time of Manningham's entry, he was yet to have any of his eight children with his wife:

"Around this time, although the place and date are unknown, Richard Burbage married Winifred Turner (d. 1642): it must have been before 7 October 1601, when Simon Forman noted that 'Winfret Burbidg', aged twenty-five, had consulted him, complaining of 'moch pain head back belly shoulders' (Bodl. Oxf., MS Ashmole 411, fol. 150). Between 1603 and 1619 the couple had eight children (the last born posthumously to Richard) baptized at St Leonard, Shoreditch, all but one dying young."[8]

[1] Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.). "at game", P1; in "game", n. Accessed March 2013. [2] Hardyng, John (1543). The chronicle of Ihon Hardyng in metre. EEBO, STC 12766.7. p.cxxxiii. [3] Pont, Robert (1599). Against sacrilege. EEBO, STC 20100. Third Sermon. [4] Gower, John (1635). Pyrgomachia. EEBO, STC 12141. File IV. [5] Spenser, Edmund (1579). The shepheardes calender. EEBO, STC 23089. Aegloga Tertia. [6] Holland, Philemon (tr.) (1603). The philosophie, commonlie called, the morals written by the learned philosopher Plutarch of Chaeronea. EEBO, STC 20063. [7] Taylor, John (1630). All the workes of Iohn Taylor the water-poet. EEBO, STC 23725. p.50. [8] Edmond, Mary (2004).

Burbage, Richard (1568–1619). In: The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, September 2004; accessed online, January 2008.

§ John Manningham was the adopted son of a wealthy City merchant, and as a student at Middle Inn he was contemporaneous with, and knew personally, the future Speaker of the House of Commons Nicholas Hare, and the revolutionary parliamentarian John Pym. Edward Curle, his source for the William the Conqueror anecdote, was a protege of Sir Robert Cecil.[1] Curle's father William was one of Cecil's retainers. Manningham was no passing friend of the Curle family, whom he mentions often in his diary. He married Edward Curle's sister Anne in around 1607.[2]

[1] All from Bellot, Hugh H. L. (1902). The Inner And Middle Temple: Legal, Literary And Historic Associations. pp.286–7. [2] All from Bruce, J. (ed.) (1868). John Manningham: Diary, 1602–1603. p.vii.

§ There is no decisive evidence to tell whether or not the anecdote is substantially true. Charles Nicholl likens the situation to Beatlemania, with early modern actors becoming the subject of adoring fans, a stereotype for which he gives some evidence. He emphasises the sexual element surrounding Burbage, and this leads him to the conclusion that the story is of the generic jest-book type. These stories, he points out, were often projected onto famous figures.[1] The emphasis that Nicholl puts on sexuality seems, however, misplaced. Although the story may open with a sexual advance, the reason why the story is told at all is not because of an advance made to Burbage, but because of the wit displayed by Shakespeare. It may be that the stereotype about the lothario actor is the ground of the story, but it is not the reason for the story's transmission.

The idea that the anecdote may be a jest-book story projected onto a famous figure may be an anachronism, caused by viewing Shakespeare as a much more famous figure now than he was in his own period. This is supported by the fact that Manningham's account has an explanation at the end, which Manningham felt necessary to include, that Shakespeare's forename is William. One does not have explain a person's forename if they are famous, and this story therefore does not share the typology of a generic jest-book story projected onto a famous person. This also

helps to discount, for example, any motivation grounded in a social or personal knowledge of Shakespeare. If Shakespeare's forename was not widely known in Manningham's circle, how likely is it that Manningham knew much at all about his family, background, or character? It seems that the reason why Manningham wrote it down at all was simply because it is a funny story. This discounts sympathy with, say, Shakespeare's social class, but it does not bear on the question of jest-book typology.

Unfortunately, though these reasonings give some insight into why Manningham recorded the story, they do not reveal much about the story's path to Manningham. One very slight connection between Shakespeare and Manningham is that Sir Robert Cecil was invited to see a play by the Lord Chamberlain's Men in 1595.[2] It is possible that the Cecil circle knew of the story and that this was the source of its transmission to Curle, but the Middle Temple was a well connected place, and so it is quite possible that Curle could have obtained the story from anyone. The King's Men had also been to the Middle Temple to play *Twelfth Night, or What You Will* just the month before, which Manningham had himself recorded.

[1] Nicholl, Charles (2007). The Lodger. p.240. [2] Q.v. 7th December 1595.

21st March 1602 — Dethick and Camden, the Garter and Clarencieux Kings-at-Arms respond to a complaint from the York Herald-of-Arms; they mention John Shakespeare's application, which they had been accused of awarding without valid basis.

[*] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.172. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.22–3; and SS DL, pp.171–2 for facsimiles of the York Herald's complaint.

19th April 1602 — *1 Contention*, *2 Contention*, and *Titus Andronicus* are transferred from Thomas Millington to Thomas Pavier in the Stationers' Register.

[1] Arber 3, p.80b / 204, and SS R&I, p.215.

§ "The first and Second parte of Henry the VJ^{t} / ij bookes"[1] Halliwell-Phillipps said, on recording this entry in 1843,[2] that the "entry is a mistake for the First and Second parts of the 'Contention'", i.e. 1 and 2 *Contention*, giving further credence for thinking

of those plays as parts one and two of a single two part unit. Interestingly, he adds that "when Blount and Jaggard, in 1623, inserted a list of Shakespeare's plays 'as are not formerly entered to other men,' they omitted the first and second parts of Henry VI., and only inserted 'The Third Parte of Henry the Sixt.'". This implies that the 1623 entry for the "Third Parte" of Henry VI was actually for *1st Henry VI*, the prequel which in the First Folio is called the first part.

[1] Arber 3, p.80b / 204. [2] Halliwell, James Orchard (1843). The First Sketches of the Second and Third Parts of King Henry the Sixth. p.xii.

1st May 1602 — Shakespeare buys 107 acres of land in Stratford.

* Facsimile of the sale record in SS DL, pp.189–90.

§ Shakespeare bought the land for £320 from William and John Combe.[1] This was one of his most significant purchases along with New Place (for an unknown sum, but probably more than £400),[2] on 4th May 1597; and his later tithes purchase (for £440), on 24th July 1605. Shakespeare is not known to have invested as much capital after the tithes purchase—the Blackfriars purchase costing only a quarter of this amount—despite continuing to work as a dramatist with a share in the Globe for many years. Much of his earnings are therefore not accounted for.

[1] HP O2, p.17 and EKC F&P2, pp.107–109. [2] Eccles, pp.131–2 says that Thomas Greene paid £400 for his own house in 1611, but it was not as large as New Place.

3rd May 1602 — Richard Quiney keeps the toll-book of horses exchanged at the Stratford fair, is grievously wounded by one of the Lord of the Manor's men on this night or the next, and dies the same month from his injuries.

* Eccles, pp.98–8.

31st May 1602 — Richard Quiney is buried.

* Eccles, p.99.

26th July 1602 — *Hamlet* is entered into the Stationers' Register, by James Roberts.

* Arber 3, p.84b / 212, and SS R&I, p.215.

11th August 1602 — *Thomas Lord Cromwell* is entered into the Stationers' Register, printed in the same year, and attributed to "W.S.".

* Arber 3, p.85b / 214, and SS R&I, p.215. Cf. Lee, Sidney (1916). A Life of William Shakespeare. 1st edition. p.261.

28th September 1602 — Shakespeare buys a cottage and garden in Chapel Lane in Stratford.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.191. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.111–2.

29th September 1602 — Hercules Underhill confirms Shakespeare's ownership of New Place.

* Facsimile of the confirmation in SS DL, p.175. DLB 263, pp.122–134 explains that the legal document "reconveys New Place to Shakespeare and offers additional legal protection for his claim to the property". It is presumably no coincidence that this reconveyance takes place one day after Shakespeare's purchase of a cottage and garden in Stratford.

26th December 1602 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play in front of the Queen at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.328.

1603

1603 — Shakespeare is listed as having acted in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*.

§ The information comes in a note after the text of *Sejanus* in Jonson's *Works* of 1616.[1] The play is said there to have been first acted in 1603 by the King's Men. The principal actors are given in two columns of four actors, the left list being Burbage, Philips, Sly, and Lowin, and the right being Shakespeare, Heminges, Condell, and Cooke. This list is exactly the same as that given in the same book for *Every Man Out of his Humour*, first performed in 1599, only with the omission there of Shakespeare and Lowin.[2] Lowin had probably joined the company after the performances of *Every Man* and before *Sejanus*. Shakespeare on the other hand may simply not have acted in the earlier play, but perhaps he just took on a smaller role, or was omitted from the list to keep the columns even.

In the first quarto of *Sejanus* printed in 1605, Jonson writes "that this Booke, in all numbers, is not the same with that which was acted on the publike Stage, wherein a second Pen had a good share: in place of which I haue rather chosen, to put weaker (and no doubt lesse pleasing) of mine own, than to defraud so happy a *Genius* of his right, by my lothed vsurpation."[3] There has of course been speculation as to the identity of the *Genius*, but no copy of the original play text is known to have survived, and so there is no extra information.

Jonson's choice of wording does, however, sound unusual. Was the "right" of the Genius the right to publish his share later on independently? In that case would the Genius not also need to obtain Jonson's permission to have both shares of the play printed together? Or did Jonson simply expect that the other writer would do what Jonson did, and simply edit out the other's share and form a variant *Sejanus*? Or does the right refer to something else? In either case, why does Jonson not feel that he can ask permission of the second pen? If Jonson was collaborating with this happy Genius just two years previously, and if the Genius was still so approvingly referred to and kindly treated by Jonson when he came to publish the quarto, then what was the barrier to permission? If it were a case of company rights, then why does Jonson refer

to it as a personal issue? And how did Jonson manage to keep his own rights? The fact that Jonson would refer to the hypothetical intent of publishing the Genius's work as "loathed vsurpation" is also unusual. Was the Genius particularly touchy about other people publishing his work without consent? Shakespeare was unhappy about the publication of his content without permission in the *Passionate Pilgrim*, according to Thomas Heywood writing in 1612.[4] But many authors may have felt the same.

[1] Jonson, Ben (1616). The workes of Beniamin Ionson. EEBO, STC 14752. p.478. [2] EKC F&P2, p.72. [3] EKC F&P2, p.206. [4] EKC F&P2, p.218.

1603 — The first quarto of *Hamlet* is published.

[*] Shakespeare, William (1603). The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke. EEBO, STC 22275.

January 1603 — Lewis Hiccox, probably a tenant of Shakespeare now living in part or all of the Henley Street residence, obtains a license for an inn.

[*] HP O1, p.381 mentions the license, and Weis, René (2007). Shakespeare Unbound. p.407 contends that Hiccox used the whole of the property as the inn.

§ Hiccox was probably granted a lease on the property by Shakespeare some time after his father's death in 1601, and converted it to an inn called The Maidenhead. Though it is not known for sure that Hiccox possessed a lease already by 1603, there are several pieces of evidence in favour of this. When noted as licensed to sell ale in 1604, Hiccox is listed with one Robert Brooks, and both he and Brooks are listed as living in Henley Street in 1606. An inventory of Hiccox's goods from 9th July 1627 (q.v.) records him as having been granted a long lease on the property by William Shakespeare.[1] Brooks apparently owned a small inn immediately next door to Hiccox called The Bell, and the two families were familiar with one another.[2] The old Shakespeare home is specifically called The Maidenhead in the mid 17th century, and there was a Maidenhead inn mentioned in Stratford, without a specific reference of its location, in 1612.[3]

[1] All from Jones, Jeanne E. (1994). Lewis Hiccox and Shakespeare's Birthplace. Notes and Queries, 41.4, December 1994. p.498. [2] HP O1, p.379, and HP O1, p.381–2. [3] HP O1, p.383.

§ The Henley Street residence consisted of eastern and western sides, usually called the Woolshop and the Birthplace respectively, and an annex to the back of the west side. The annex is sometimes referred to as Joan Hart's cottage.[1] Fripp says that Joan "occupied part of the house, probably the vacated 'Back', with her husband, William Hart."[2] Jeanne Jones notes that it has "been suggested that a cottage to the west of the property was used by the Harts and that this was where their kitchen was situated. Certainly the house as it stands at present, does not [sic] contain two kitchens, one for the inn and one for the Harts."[3] Joan Hart's cottage, the Back, and the cottage to the west presumably all refer to the same building. In other words, the suggestion is that Hiccox had the lease on the eastern bay (Woolshop) already from William, and Joan leased him the western bay (Birthplace) as well and lived with her husband in this much smaller annex. Rene Weis says that this suggestion is the only way in which we can "account for the number of rooms that made up the Hiccox (1627) and Rutter (1648) inventories. This hypothesis may be underpinned by the fact that in the eighteenth century the Harts reclaimed the westernmost bay as living quarters. They could do so only if they had leased them out in the first place, and that may have been as long ago as the time of William Shakespeare".[4]

[1] Weis, René (2007). Shakespeare Unbound. p.312, for example. [2] Fripp M&A1, p.454. [3] Jones, Jeanne E. (1994). Lewis Hiccox and Shakespeare's Birthplace. Notes and Queries, 41.4, December 1994. p.500. [4] Weis, René (2007). Shakespeare Unbound. p.407.

§ When was Joan Hart's cottage built? Weis suggests that a 1590s levy on the Birthplace which was much higher than the levy on the Woolshop indicates that the cottage was already built by then and was included towards the Birthplace levy. On the other hand the grounds to the west adjoining the Birthplace may have been the source of the higher rate.[1]

[1] Weis, René (2007). Shakespeare Unbound. p.452.

1603 — John Davies of Hereford refers to Shakespeare and Richard Burbage in an marginal note to his *Microcosmos*.

[*] Davies, John (1603). Microcosmos. EEBO, STC 6333. p.215. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.126.

1603 — Henry Chettle alludes to Shakespeare as "Melicert" in a poem commemorating the death of Elizabeth I.

* Anon [Chettle, Henry] (1603). Englands Mourning Garment. EEBO, STC 5122. Sig. B3r. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.123.

1603 — An anonymous poet mentions Shakespeare by name in a poem commemorating the death of Elizabeth I.

* Anon (1603a). A Mournefull Dittie. EEBO, STC 7589. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.124.

2nd Feburary 1603 — The Lord Chamberlain's Men play in front of the Queen at Richmond.

* EKC F&P2, p.328.

7th February 1603 — *Troilus and Cressida* is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.91b / 226, and SS R&I, p.216.

19th March 1603 — The theatres were closed because the Queen had been taken gravely ill.

* EKC ES 4, p.335.

24th March 1603 — Queen Elizabeth dies.

* Pryor, Felix (2003). Elizabeth I: Her Life in Letters. p.133.

5th April 1603 — James VI of Scotland, about to be crowned James I of England and also to become the new patron of what were the Lord Chamberlain's Men, leaves Edinburgh for London.

* Kinney, Arthur F. (2001). Lies Like Truth: Shakespeare, Macbeth, and the Cultural Moment. p.77.

28th April 1603 — Queen Elizabeth is buried.

* Townsend, George Henry (1867). A Manual of Dates. p.367.

7th May 1603 — King James arrives in London and immediately bans "Beare-bayting, Bul-bayting, Enterludes, Common Playes, or other like disordered or unlawful Exercises" on the sabbath.

* EKC ES 4, p.335.

9th May 1603 — Henslowe writes that playing began again "by the kynges licence".

* Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). Documents of the Rose Playhouse. pp.212–3.

17th May 1603 — A warrant for letters patent is made for the Lord Chamberlain's Men to become the King's Men.

* Facsimile of the warrant in SS DL, p.197.

19th May 1603 — A royal patent is issued for the Lord Chamberlain's Men to become the King's Men, under the patronage of King James.

* Facsimile of the letters patent in SS DL, p.197. Transcriptions in Greg, W. W. (ed.) (1909). Collections, Part III. Malone Society Collections, 1.3. pp.264–5 and EKC ES 2, pp.208–9, both with further references.

5th June 1603 — Mary Hart, daughter of William Hart and Shakespeare's sister Joan Hart, is baptised.

* EKC F&P2, p.4.

12th June 1603 — William Camden refers to Shakespeare by name in a preface written on this day and published in 1605.

* Camden, William (1605). Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine. EEBO, STC 4521. Certaine Poemes section. p.8. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.127.

25th June 1603 — *Richard III*, *Richard II*, and *1 Henry IV* are transferred from Andrew Wise to Matthew Law in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.98 / 239, and SS R&I, p.216. Cf. Jowett, John (2007). Shakespeare and Text. p.183 for *Richard II* and *Richard III*; and Shakespeare, William (2002b). King Henry IV: Part 1. Kastan, David Scott (ed.), Arden. p.18 for *1 Henry IV*.

22nd July 1603 — Thomas Pope, one of the King's Men, makes his will.

* EKC ES 2, p.403.

25th July 1603 — King James I is crowned.

* Weir, Alison (2011). Britain's Royal Families: the Complete Genealogy. p.250.

17th August 1603 — Christopher Hunt enters *Love's Labour's Won* in his stock list.

* Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield (1957). Shakspere's Love's Labor's Won: New Evidence from the Account Books of an Elizabethan Bookseller. p.6, "The leaf which was at the back hinge has on its recto numerous jottings of items sold from August 9, 1603, through August 17, 1603." The play appears in a list of other sales including the *Merchant of Venice*, the *Taming of the Shrew*, and *Love's Labour's Lost*.

9th September 1603 — George Carey, 2nd Baron Hunsdon, patron of the Lord Chamberlain's Men until their conversion to the King's Men, dies.

* Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.90 & p.237.

2nd December 1603 — The King's Men perform for James I at Wilton House, the play perhaps being *As You Like It*.

§ Chambers notes a sum paid to "John Hemyngs one of his Maiesties players . . . for the paynes and expences of himself and the rest of the company in comming from Mortelake in the countie of Surrie unto the courte aforesaid and there presenting before his Maiestie one playe."[1]

[1] EKC F&P2, p.329, who also notes that the name of the play performed is from an anecdote by Lady Herbert on 5th August 1865 recounted to William Cory: "we have a letter, never printed, from Lady Pembroke to her son, telling him to bring James I from Salisbury to see *As You Like It*; 'we have the man Shakespeare with us'. She wanted to cajole the King in Raleigh's behalf—he came."

26th December 1603 — The King's Men play in front of the King at Hampton Court.

[1] EKC F&P2, p.329.

27th December 1603 — The King's Men play in front of the King at Hampton Court.

[1] EKC F&P2, p.329.

28th December 1603 — The King's Men play in front of the King at Hampton Court.

[1] EKC F&P2, p.329.

30th December 1603 — The King's Men play in front of the King at Hampton Court.

[1] EKC F&P2, p.329.

1604

1604 — Anthony Scoloker mentions Shakespeare and *Hamlet* in his *Epistle to Diaphantus, or the Passions of Love*.

* Sc., An. [Anthony Scoloker?] (1604). Diaphantus. EEBO, STC 21853. Sig. A2r.

c.1604 — *Measure for Measure* is completed.

§ *Measure for Measure* has long been considered a strongly Jacobean play, the parallel between James and the duke being first suggested by Chalmers.[1] There are parallels in plot and phrase to *Sejanus* by Ben Jonson,[2] which is said in Jonson's *Works* to have first been acted by the King's Men in 1603,[3] William Shakespeare being one of the players. Though it is not known when in 1603 *Sejanus* was first performed, Ayres comments that this would be "between 25 March 1603 and 24 March 1604, the old-style dates for the beginning and end of the year".[4] Chambers points out that since the theatre was closed, Jonson probably wrote the play for court performances at the end of the year, dating *Sejanus* to the autumn or winter of 1603. This places the writing of *Measure for Measure* in 1604, before its first recorded performance on 26th December 1604.[5]

[1] Lloyd, William Watkiss (1875). Critical Essays on the Plays of Shakespeare. p.33. [2] Shakespeare, William (2006b). Measure for Measure. Gibbons, Brian (ed.), Cambridge. p.22. [3] Cf. 1603, the performance of *Sejanus*. [4] Jonson, Ben (1990). Sejanus his Fall. Ayres, Philip J. (ed.). p.9. [5] EKC F&P2, p.331.

§ In December 1603, Sir Griffin Markham, and the Lords Cobham and Grey, were awaiting execution in Winchester having been implicated in the murky Raleigh Conspiracy earlier that year.[1] On 10th December they were led to the scaffold, and the Sheriff "made a short speech unto them, by way of the interrogatory of the heinousness of their offences, the justness of their trials, their lawful condemnation, and due execution there to be performed; to all which they assented".[2] Then, the Sheriff asked them to behold the mercy of their prince, King James, who had sent a countermand to the execution, and spared their lives. This has clear parallels to the last act of *Measure for Measure*, as noted by Robert A. Shedd in the middle of the 20th century,[3] and reinforces the *Sejanus* evidence, linking the play to the last month of

1603 and possibly indicating that it was written at the beginning of 1604 rather than the middle or end of that year.[4]

[1] See Nicholls, Mark and Williams, Penry (2011). Sir Walter Raleigh: in Life and Legend. p.225, and the letter of Sir Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain in e.g. Anon [Yorke, Philip] (1778). Miscellaneous State Papers. Vol. 1. pp.391–2, edited by the 2nd Earl of Hardwicke. For more details on the trials, see Nicholls, Mark (1995). Two Winchester Trials: the Prosecution of Henry, Lord Cobham, and Thomas, Lord Grey of Wilton, 1603. Historical Research, 68.165; February. p.26; and Nicholls, Mark (2005). Sir Walter Ralegh's Treason: a Prosecution Document. The English Historical Review, 110.438. pp.902–924 for defence of the adjective "murky". [2] Sir Dudley Carleton's letter, as in Anon [Yorke, Philip] (1778). Miscellaneous State Papers. Vol. 1. p.391. Carleton's letter is dated 11th December, and he writes of these events as having taken place "yesterday, being Friday". [3] Shedd, Robert A. (1953), an unpublished University of Michigan dissertation, cited via a chain of references recorded in Shakespeare, William (2006b). Measure for Measure. Gibbons, Brian (ed.), Cambridge. p.23. See also Ross, Lawrence J. (1997). Measure for Measure: an Essay in Criticism of Shakespeare's Drama. p.166. [4] See also Shakespeare, William (2006b). Measure for Measure. Gibbons, Brian (ed.), Cambridge. p.23, the "parallels to *Sejanus* might point to a date near the beginning of 1604 for *Measure for Measure*."

§ Wells and Taylor suggest that the opening to Act 1.2 was added by another writer, perhaps Thomas Middleton, and that Act 3.1 to 4.1 have been altered by the transposition of material and the inclusion of a popular song.[1] These minor revisions, which are undateable, do not affect the question of the date of original composition.

[1] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.843.

c.1604 — *All's Well That Ends Well* is written.

§ *All's Well That Ends Well* is not mentioned by Francis Meres in his relatively complete 1598 list of Shakespearean plays,[1] and the part of Lavatch suits Robert Armin who joined the Lord Chamberlain's Men in about 1599.[2] Echoes of *Hamlet* in the opening scene help to date the play after 1600.[3] There is some thematic link with Shakespeare's *Sonnets* which places it before 1609, and Russell A. Fraser suggests tentatively that the theme of a monarch "dying and reborn", in his words, is connected with the accession of James after Elizabeth.[4] More concretely, the discussion by Parolles of virginity, and especially a disparaging remark about old

virginity, in Act 1.1 would be unlikely on the Elizabethan stage but more acceptable on the Jacobean stage. There are also stylistic parallels with *Measure for Measure*.[5]

[1] Meres, Francis (1598). Palladis Tamia. EEBO, STC 17834. Part 2, p.282. [2] Haley, David (1993). Shakespeare's Courtly Mirror. p.254, and cf. c.1599 the writing of *As You Like It*. [3] Shakespeare, William (2008b). All's Well That Ends Well. Snyder, Susan (ed.), Oxford. p.21. [4] Shakespeare, William (2003b). All's Well That Ends Well. Fraser, Russell (ed.), Cambridge. p.10. [5] Waller, Gary Fredric (2007). All's Well That Ends Well: New Critical Essays. p.3. According to Shakespeare, William (2008b). All's Well That Ends Well. Snyder, Susan (ed.), Oxford. p.23, the Parolles point comes from Dover Wilson; Snyder discusses the point extensively too.

§ In 1997, Gary Taylor summarised a series of metrical tests for dating *All's Well That Ends Well*.[1] These tests were conducted relative to other plays, not to years. By mapping the plays onto years using the present work, the metrical tests can be used to determine a very tentative date for *All's Well That Ends Well*. Two pairs of tests overlap through 1603–04, and three overlap through 1606–08. Of the tests which date the play to a specific year, the test which Taylor considers most reliable dates it between 1604 and 1605, and the other dates it to 1606. There is little to choose between the earlier dates (1603–05) and the later dates (1606–08); the play may even have been revised. But since Taylor considers the 1604–05 test to be the most reliable, and since there is more affinity between *All's Well* and *Measure for Measure* (1604) than there is between *All's Well* and *King Lear* and *Timon of Athens* (both 1605), the least objectionable date for *All's Well* is 1604.

[1] Wells, Stanley, and Taylor, Gary (1997). William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion. pp.126–7.

c.1604 — Shakespeare's additions to *Sir Thomas More* are written.

[*] Taylor, Gary (2009). The Date and Auspices of the Additions to Sir Thomas More. In: Howard-Hill, T. H. (ed.). Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More. p.122 says that 1603–4 fit the most precise indicators. 1603 was a plague year when the theatres were mostly shut, so 1604 seems the most reasonable date. Metz's piece, Metz, G. Harold (2009). Voice and Credyt: the Scholars and Sir Thomas More. Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More, ed. T. H. Howard-Hill. p.29, which is more of a summary, also supports a post-1600 date; Taylor is the most specific about it. There has been much contention about the date of Shakespeare's additions, especially with some scholars suggesting an earlier date.

c.1604 — John Cooke refers to Shakespeare by name in an epigram.

* EKC Allusions, p.140, where the attribution was not yet known. DLB 263, pp.143–158 identifies "I.C." as John Cooke.

1st January 1604 — The King's Men perform two plays in front of the King at Hampton Court, one of which was *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

* EKC F&P2, p.329.

2nd February 1604 — The King's Men play in front of the King at Hampton Court.

* EKC F&P2, p.329.

15th February 1604 — Sir Dudley Carleton sends a letter to John Chamberlain, in which he mentions the recent performance of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

* EKC F&P2, pp.329–30.

19th February 1604 — The King's Men play in front of the King at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.329.

15th March 1604 — King James proceeds through London, for which occasion Shakespeare and the rest of the King's Men had been given four yards of red cloth each.

* EKC ES 2, p.186.

27th March 1604 — William Shakespeare sells Philip Rogers 3 bushels of malt for 6s.

* Shakespeare later sued Rogers over this and subsequent sales; a facsimile of the record is in SS DL, p.182. Cf. DLB 263, pp.143–158, citing Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). The Shakespeare Documents. Vol. 2. p.369–71. Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1901). Shakespeare's Family. p.121 disagrees that these entries refer to the poet, preferring a William Shakespeare who lived in Warwick. Of this Warwick William she says that it has "seemed to me much more than probable that this was the William who sued Philip Rogers in the Court of Record at Stratford-on-Avon, in 1604 for the price of a strike of malt sold and other money due. 'The declaration filed by William Shexspere' in the Court has been accepted by Halliwell-Phillipps", meaning that he accepted it as referring to the poet. But, Stopes continues, "in the first place, any such declaration at that date would then have designated our Shakespeare 'gent.'; in the second, he would have employed his cousin, Thomas

Greene, as his attorney, and not William Tetherton, and Thomas Greene would have spelt his name otherwise than it is written. In the third place, there is no corroborative testimony that the poet ever sold malt, and there is concerning this contemporary William."

10th April 1604 — William Shakespeare sells Philip Rogers 4 bushels of malt for 8s.

* Cf. 27th March 1604.

24th April 1604 — William Shakespeare sells Philip Rogers 3 bushels of malt for 6s.

* Cf. 27th March 1604.

3rd May 1604 — William Shakespeare sells Philip Rogers 4 bushels of malt for 8s.

* Cf. 27th March 1604.

15th May 1604 — Shakespeare and others of the King's Men are recorded as being granted scarlet cloth for the pageant of James I's entry into London.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.199.

16th May 1604 — William Shakespeare sells Philip Rogers 4 bushels of malt for 8s.

* Cf. 27th March 1604.

30th May 1604 — William Shakespeare sells Philip Rogers 2 bushels of 3s 10d.

* Cf. 27th March 1604.

25th June 1604 — William Shakespeare lends Philip Rogers two shillings.

* Cf. 27th March 1604.

15th August 1604 — The King's Men are available and perhaps perform for James I and the Spanish Ambassador at Somerset House, until 27th August.

§ "To Augustine Phillippes and John Hemynges for the allowaunce of themselves and tenne of theire ffellowes his Ma^{tes} groomes of the chamber, and Players for waytinge

and attendinge on his Ma[tes] service by commandemente uppon the Spanishe Ambassador at Somersette House the space of xviii dayes viz from the xvth day of Auguste 1604 untill the xxviith day of the same as appeareth by a bill therof signed by the Lord chamberlayne [for] xxili xiis."[1]

[1] Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.199, and transcript in DLB 263, pp.143–158. Not mentioned in EKC F&P2, p.330, perhaps because it is not certain that any plays were performed.

24th October 1604 — A survey of Rowington Manor lists Shakepeare's Chapel Lane cottage in Stratford.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.191. EKC F&P2, p.112.

1st November 1604 — The King's Men play *Othello* at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

4th November 1604 — The King's Men play the *Merry Wives of Windsor*.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

19th November 1604 — Stephen Belott marries Mary Mountjoy, and Shakespeare had played a part in the matchmaking.

[1] Cooper, Tarnya (ed.) (2006). Searching for Shakespeare. p.19.

26th December 1604 — The King's Men play *Measure for Measure* for St. Stephen's Night.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

28th December 1604 — The King's Men play the *Comedy of Errors*, on the 10th anniversary of the famous Night of Errors.

* EKC F&P2, p.331. Cf. 28th December 1594.

1605

1605 — *King Lear* is completed.

§ Shakespeare makes use in *King Lear* of the *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* by Samuel Harsnett, entered in the Stationers' Register on 16th March 1603,[1] and printed in that year; and of John Florio's translation of Montaigne also printed in 1603. The play was performed at court before James on 26th November 1606, according to the Stationers' Register entry for the first quarto, entered on 26th November 1607: "A booke called. M^{r} Will[ia]m Shakespeare his historye of Kinge Lear as yt was played before the King[es] maiestie at Whitehall vppon S^{t} Stephans knight at [Chr]istm^{a}s Last by his ma^{ties} servant[e]s playinge vsually at the globe on the banksyde".[2] These set the period between 1603 and 1606 inclusive as the most reasonable limits for composition of the play.

There are plausible uses in *King Lear* of *Eastward Ho!* by Chapman, Jonson, and Marston, written by April 1605, entered in the Stationers' Register on 4th September 1605,[3] and printed in the same year; and possibly of the *Miseries of Enforced Marriage* by George Wilkins.[4] More tenuous parallels have been discerned between *King Lear* and *On Sejanus* by William Strachey, printed after 6th August 1605; and *The Fleire* by Edward Sharpham, entered in the Stationers' Register on 13th May 1606.[5] The reference to "These late eclipses in the sun and moon" in Act 1.2 of *King Lear* may refer to eclipses of the moon in April and September, and of the sun on 2nd October 1605.[6] These references cumulatively point to a 1605 date as most likely for the original version of the play.[7]

[1] Arber 3, p.93 / 229. [2] Arber 3, p.161b / 366; transcript from Shakespeare, William (2008h). King Lear. Wells, Stanley (ed.), Oxford. pp.9–10. [3] Arber 3, p.128b / 300. [4] The play was entered on 31st July 1607, according to Arber 3, p.157 / 357. Shakespeare, William (2008h). King Lear. Wells, Stanley (ed.), Oxford. pp.13–4 says: "Taylor also argues that Shakespeare was influenced by George Wilkins's play *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, based on a pamphlet describing a murder committed on 23 April 1605 which was entered for publication on 12 June of that year. The play can have been written no earlier than June 1605, and the presence in its text of numerous oaths strongly suggests composition before the passing of the 'Act to Restrain Abuses of Players', forbidding profanity, of May 1606. Since the play was performed, and probably written for, Shakespeare's company, he may

well have read it soon after it was written, sometime between June 1605 and May 1606." The entry for the pamphlet is transcribed in Arber 3, p.124b / 292. [5] Arber 3, p.139 / 321. [6] All from Shakespeare, William (2008h). King Lear. Wells, Stanley (ed.), Oxford. p.13, and Shakespeare, William (2005h). The Tragedy of King Lear. Halio, Jay L. (ed.), Cambridge. p.1. Wells is skeptical about the eclipses, whereas Halio is more willing to accept the reference as evidence. Their probability in the present work is not weighed in isolation, but only treated as a potential indication within the accumulated set of indications. [7] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.909 consider *King Lear* to be a case apart from all other forms of authorial revision amongst the plays known to have been revised by Shakespeare. They call the changes to *King Lear* "structural" compared to "local" changes in the other plays. This may be so, qualitatively; but quantitatively the additions to *King Lear* are of the same magnitude of those to, for example, *Othello*.

§ A play called *King Leir* of unknown authorship was performed in 1594, and entered in the Stationers' Register in the same year.[1] No copy of this is known to have survived, so it may not have been printed. It was entered in the Stationers' Register again on 8th May 1605, and printed in the same year.[2] Speaking of the anonymous *King Leir* play, Stanley Wells says that Shakespeare "may even have acted in it when it was performed, in or before 1594, probably by the Queen's Men."[3] On the other hand, Richard Knowles makes a case that Shakespeare may have seen *Leir* in or before 1594; that he may have seen it acted after 1594, but that this is unlikely; that there is no reason to believe Shakespeare ever acted in the play; that there is no reason to believe that he had a manuscript of the play; and that his use of *Leir* strongly implies he read the 1605 version.[4] But the 1605 title page of *Leir* states that it was "diuers and sundry times lately acted",[5] so would Shakespeare have needed to read the play in manuscript? Did the divers and sundry performances of *Leir* noted on its title page come before its 8th May 1605 Stationers' Register entry,[6] or after it, or both?

Judging from the few literary parallels for *King Lear*, it seems most likely that it was written after May 1605, which means that the printing of *Leir* more likely inspired Shakespeare to base a new play on the subject. The alternative argument is that the old *Leir* was published once Shakespeare's *King Lear* had become popular, to capitalise on the success, and this remains a possibility despite not being the most plausible scenario supported by the documentary evidence. Either way, this points to *King Lear* having been either started in mid 1605, or having been completed not long before May 1605, putting the completion of *King Lear* in 1605 regardless of scenario.

[1] Arber 2, p.307 / 649. [2] Arber 3, p.123 / 289 for the Stationers' Register entry; all the rest from Shakespeare, William (2008h). King Lear. Wells, Stanley (ed.), Oxford. p.10. [3] Shakespeare, William (2008h). King Lear. Wells, Stanley (ed.), Oxford. p.12. [4] Knowles, Richard (2003). How Shakespeare Knew King Leir. In: Holland, Peter (ed.). King Lear and its Afterlife. p.35. [5] Shakespeare, William (2005h). The Tragedy of King Lear. Halio, Jay L. (ed.), Cambridge. p.1. [6] Arber 3, p.123 / 289.

§ A Cordelia Taylor was baptised on 1st December 1605 in the parish of St. Olave, Silver Street, where Shakespeare had been living in around 1604. The researcher who found this entry describes it as "evidently the first time the Latinate form of the Welsh 'Cordula' was bestowed on a real child".[1] "Cordella" is the form of the name used in the 1605 edition of *King Leir*.[2] The use of the name for Cordelia Taylor in 1605 is unlikely to be coincidence, but could have beed derived from either version of the play. This evidence indicates the popularity of the Lear story in 1605.

[1] Nelson, Alan H. (1998a). Calling All (Shakespeare) Biographers! Or, a Plea for Documentary Discipline. In: Kozuka, Takashi and Mulryne, J. R. (eds.). Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson. p.63. [2] Anon (1605). The true chronicle history of King Leir. EEBO, STC 15343. Title page, and ff..

1605 — *The London Prodigal* is published, falsely attributed to "William Shakespeare" on the title page.

[*] Shakespeare, William [Anon] (1605). The London Prodigal. EEBO, STC 22333. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.147.

c.1605 — *Timon of Athens* is written by Shakespeare and Thomas Middleton.

§ *Timon of Athens* is not known in any allusion, reference, or edition prior to its inclusion in the First Folio in 1623.[1] Even the inclusion there seems to have been a last minute choice to replace *Troilus and Cressida*, which at the time was thought likely to be withdrawn.[2] The lack of references has led to the natural question of whether *Timon of Athens* was ever performed on the stage at all before its inclusion in the First Folio.[3] There is a general consensus that the play is unfinished.[4] *Timon of Athens* is a collaboration between Shakespeare, who contributed about two thirds of the text, and Thomas Middleton, who contributed the other third.[5] It is the best evidence of collaboration between those two playwrights. If it had not been for the problem with

Troilus and Cressida, this evidence of collaboration between Shakespeare and Middleton may not have come to light.

[1] This includes the suggestion in Billington, Sandra (1998). Was Timon of Athens Performed Before 1604? Notes and Queries, 45.3. September 1998. p.353 that *Timon* was written, and alluded to by Marston, in 1600. Acceptance of that argument entails the acceptance of several further points: that the prologue of Marston's play is to be taken seriously down to individual points of reference; that there was no prior play about Timon apart from the anonymous work of 1602; that the unknown Middleton came straight out of Oxford to collaborate with Shakespeare in the year he was working on Hamlet; and that Marston's references are to other works rather than just the general story of Timon. The discovery of Marston's mention of Timon is important to have on record, but the association with Shakespeare and Middleton's play should be left aside until further evidence comes to light. [2] Blayney, Peter W. M. (1991). The First Folio of Shakespeare. p.17, and pp.21–4, via West, Anthony James (2003). The Shakespeare First Folio. Vol. 2. p.66. [3] Vickers, Brian (2004). Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays. p.9, for example, qualifies discussion of *Timon* with "if it was ever performed". [4] Shakespeare, William and Middleton, Thomas (2008). Timon of Athens. Dawson, Anthony B. (ed.), Arden. p.18, who cites Ellis-Fermor, Una (1942). Timon of Athens: an Unfinished Play. Review of English Studies, Vol. 18. pp.270–83. [5] Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008b). Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works. p.467.

§ Based on similarities between *Timon* and *Coriolanus*, Dawson dates the play thematically to 1607,[1] despite having argued no less extensively for stylistic links with *King Lear*: "The two plays certainly share important features, most notably a tragic hero who suffers from ingratitude, retreats into the wilderness and rails against mankind; moreover, each features a loyal servant (Kent/Flavius), obsessive preoccupation with sexual diseases and animality, and a representation of the central male figure as in some ways maternal."[2]

The distinction between theme and style here is important. Theme pertains to the sources from which the playwrights developed the overall plot, whereas style consists of the more granular features within the play such as which motifs were used. The argument is that because Shakespeare used Plutarch for *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*, and because he used the same source for *Timon of Athens*, it is likely that he wrote those three plays at roughly the same time. But *Coriolanus* was written in 1608, two years after *Antony and Cleopatra*, and Shakespeare had been using Plutarch at least since *Julius Caesar* in 1599. Moreover, Shakespeare wasn't the only playwright involved with *Timon of Athens*; and though he is apparently responsible for the first and last

scenes, it is still possible that Middleton suggested the plot to Shakespeare. The psychological abstractions of the play do seem more suited to Middleton.

[1] Shakespeare, William and Middleton, Thomas (2008). Timon of Athens. Dawson, Anthony B. (ed.), Arden. p.18. [2] Shakespeare, William and Middleton, Thomas (2008). Timon of Athens. Dawson, Anthony B. (ed.), Arden. p.14.

§ There are three points derived from within *Timon of Athens* that help to date it. The first is that it is one of only two plays in the First Folio, the other being *Antony and Cleopatra*, to lack act divisions. Acts were required only for indoor playing, to allow for the replacement of candles, and the *King's Men* played indoors for the first time on a regular basis only after August 1608, having purchased the Blackfriars theatre.[1] The second pertains to the several possible allusions to the *Two Most Unnatural and Bloody Murders* which was entered in the Stationers' Register on 12th June 1605.[2] The third is the reference of Timon's servant to "those that under hot ardent zeal would set whole realms on fire".[2] This was in a section by Middleton, and may refer to the Gunpowder Plot of November 1605, with the proverb "set whole hearts on fire".[3] The fire accords with the heat of the zeal, and fire can spread; but the Gunpowder Plot was not to burn parliament to the ground but to explode it with considerable force. Nonetheless, Jowett points out that the "comment is extraneous to the dramatic situation, and this strengthens the case for its being a topical allusion."[4]

Metrical tests date *Timon of Athens* to after *All's Well That Ends Well* (c.1604), around *King Lear* (1605), and before *Macbeth* (1606). Middleton used the *Two Most Unnatural and Bloody Murders* as sources for his *Yorkshire Tragedy* (1605), and *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606).[5] Stylistically, *Timon of Athens* has been compared most strongly to *King Lear*, and *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606).[6] On these bases, then, it is reasonable to date the play to either 1605 or 1606. Shakespeare, who wrote the larger share of *Timon of Athens*, wrote only one play in 1605, and two in 1606 despite the closure of the theatres in July 1606. This fact, coupled with Middleton's use of the *Two Most Unnatural and Bloody Murders* in his 1605 works and the possible reference to the Gunpowder plot, which could have been inserted during composition or for early performances, makes 1605 the more reasonable date.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2008r). Timon of Athens. Jowett, John (ed.), Oxford. pp.4–5. [2] Arber 3, p.124b / 292. [3] All from Shakespeare, William (2008r). Timon of Athens. Jowett, John (ed.), Oxford. p.6. [4] Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008b). Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works. p.487 and p.1054. [5] Shakespeare, William (2008r). Timon of Athens. Jowett, John (ed.), Oxford. p.6. [6] All from Shakespeare, William (2008r). Timon of Athens. Jowett, John (ed.), Oxford. p.5, where he cites Wells, Stanley, and Taylor, Gary (1997). William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion. p.128. In Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.943, Wells and Taylor again conjecturally date *Timon of Athens* to 1605–6. Shakespeare, William and Middleton, Thomas (2008). Timon of Athens. Dawson, Anthony B. (ed.), Arden. p.14 notes a problem with Taylor's rare vocabulary test, that he cites Eliot Slater but Slater does not distinguish between Shakespearean and Middletonian sections. He also dismisses the colloquialism-in-verse test because *King Lear* gives anomalous results, but does not mention the fact that the *History of King Lear* quarto (Q1) does not give anomalous results. [7] Shakespeare, William and Middleton, Thomas (2008). Timon of Athens. Dawson, Anthony B. (ed.), Arden. p.14 and p.16. This is a result of placing more emphasis on the stylistic parallels than the thematic parallels.

c.1605 — An anonymous author appears to allude to Shakespeare as a frugal player coming to London, and to Burbage, in a tract called *Ratseis Ghost*.

* EKC Allusions, p.154. Cf. Honan, p.436.

January 1605 — In or shortly before this month Sir Walter Cope writes to Robert Cecil, Lord Cranborne, about a performance of *Love's Labour's Lost*, a play which Burbage recommended to him.

* HP O2, p.165.

§ "Sir, / I have sent and bene all thys morning huntyng for players Juglers & Such kinde of Creaturs, but fynde them harde to finde, wherfore Leavinge notes for them to seeke me, burbage ys come, & Sayes ther ys no new playe that the quene hath not scene, but they have Revyved an olde one Cawled *Loves Labore lost*, which for wytt & mirthe he sayes will please her excedingly. And Thys ys apointed to be playd to Morowe night at my Lord of Sowthamptons, unless yow send a wrytt to Remove the Corpus Cum Causa to your howse in strande. Burbage ys my messenger Ready attendyng your pleasure. / Yours most humbly, / Walter Cope"[1]

[1] Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. p.102.

January 1605 — The King's Men play *Love's Labour's Lost* some time "[b]etwin Newers Day and Twelfe day".

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

7th January 1605 — The King's Men play *Henry V*.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

8th January 1605 — The King's Men play *Every Man Out of His Humour*.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

2nd February 1605 — The King's Men play *Every Man in His Humour*.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

10th February 1605 — The King's Men play *The Merchant of Venice*.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

11th February 1605 — The King's Men play *The Spanish Maze*.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

12th February 1605 — The King's Men play *The Merchant of Venice*.

* EKC F&P2, p.331.

4th May 1605 — Augustine Phillips, one of the King's Men, makes his will and bequeaths Shakespeare a 30s gold piece.

* Facsimile of the bequeath from the will in SS DL, p.204. Cf. EKC ES 2, p.319.

24th July 1605 — Thomas Hart, son of William Hart and Shakespeare's sister Joan, is baptised.

* EKC F&P2, p.4.

24th July 1605 — Shakespeare buys a moiety in a lease of tithes costing £440 from Ralph Hubaud.

* Facsimile of the indenture in SS DL, p.193. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.119–22, and two other large purchases by Shakespeare, of New Place (unknown sum), 4th May 1597; and 107 acres of land (£320), 1st May 1602.

9th October 1605 — The King's Men were paid for a performance in Oxford.

* EKC F&P2, p.333.

4th November 1605 — The Gunpowder Plot, which may be alluded to in one of Middleton's scenes in *Timon of Athens* and also has ramifications for the date of *Macbeth*, is discovered.

* Thomas, Roy Digby (2001). Digby: the Gunpowder Plotter's Legacy. p.15.

15th December 1605 — Letters had been sent to the Lord Mayor and Justices of Middlesex and Surrey to allow the King's Men and the Queen's Men to perform "at their accustomed places".

* Greg, W. W. (ed.) (1911). Collections, Parts IV & V. Malone Society Collections, 1.4 & 1.5. p.372.

1606

1606 — William Drummond of Hawthornden records having read five works by Shakespeare in this year: *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Passionate Pilgrim* (partially by Shakespeare, and published surreptitiously), *The Rape of Lucrece*, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

* EKC Allusions, p.164.

1606 — *Macbeth* is written.

§ There is a clear reference to the Jesuit priest Henry Garnet in Act 2.3 of *Macbeth*.[1] Garnet was implicated in the Gunpowder Plot, and misled the judiciary at his trial on 28th March 1606.[2] When the deception was discovered, he used the doctrine of equivocation as a defence, essentially a tool which had been developed to strike a balance between the need to tell the truth and to keep knowledge such as evidence obtained from confessions secret. The doctrine was seen as Jesuitical, and the King was probably in no mood to be equivocated with: Garnet was executed on 3rd May 1606.[3] The porter in *Macbeth* acts as a drunken gatekeeper to Inverness castle, which he sees as hell, and lets in a farmer, an equivocator, and a tailor. The manner in which the porter introduces the equivocator makes it clear that he is referring to Garnet:[4]

Knock, knock. Who's there in th'other Deuils Name?
Faith here's an Equiuocator, that could sweare in both
the Scales against eyther Scale, who committed Treason
enough for Gods sake, yet could not equiuocate to Hea-
uen: oh come in, Equiuocator.

Swearing in both the scales against either scale means that he could swear through equivocation that something is true, and then swear that it is false. He was involved in the Gunpowder Plot which was an act of treason for the sake of the Catholic faith. That he "could not equiuocate to Heauen" may refer to the circumstances of Garnet's execution. According to H. L. Rogers, it was "said on the eve of Garnet's execution

that he would be hanged without equivocation; the Recorder at the execution asked Garnet 'not to Equiuocate with his last breath'".[5] Shakespeare rarely uses "equivocate" or its nominal form elsewhere,[6] and where he does there is no relation to treason or hints at execution. The passage in *Macbeth* does not appear to be an insertion, and does appear to be by Shakespeare. The person who played the equivocator coming onto the stage in *Macbeth* was perhaps originally dressed as a Jesuit. The reference is clear, and places the play after 3rd May 1606.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2003e). Macbeth. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxvii, Stunz, Arthur N. (1942). The Date of Macbeth. English Literary History, 9.2. p.99, Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.60. Shakespeare, William (1997). Macbeth. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge. p.5 says that the topical evidence "may be circular" and then mentions Garnet first. It is not clear what circularity could mean in the context of the Garnet evidence. [2] Stunz, Arthur N. (1942). The Date of Macbeth. English Literary History, 9.2. p.97, Dillon, Janette (2007). The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies. p.114. [3] Stunz, Arthur N. (1942). The Date of Macbeth. English Literary History, 9.2. p.97, Dillon, Janette (2007). The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies. p.114, Rogers, H. L. (1965). An English Tailor and Father Garnet's Straw. Review of English Studies, 16.61. p.44, Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.60. [4] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Tragedies. p.137. [5] Rogers, H. L. (1965). An English Tailor and Father Garnet's Straw. Review of English Studies, 16.61. p.45. [6] Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.60, confirmed by a digital search.

§ The details surrounding the fact that the Weird Sisters refer to a ship called the *Tiger* in Act 1.3 has been called "astonishing" (De Somogyi), "eerily precise" (Cambridge), and "surprising, and hard to ignore" (Oxford).[1] The first Weird Sister says of a sailor's wife:[2]

Her Husband's to Aleppo gone, Master o'th' *Tiger*:
But in a Syue Ile thither sayle,
And like a Rat without a tayle,
Ile doe, Ile doe, and Ile doe.

And later:

Sleepe shall neyther Night nor Day
Hang vpon his Pent-house Lid:
He shall liue a man forbid:
Wearie Seu'nights, nine times nine,
Shall he dwindle, peake, and pine:
Though his Barke cannot be lost,
Yet it shall be Tempest-tost.
Looke what I haue.

There was a real ship called the *Tiger* which sailed to Aleppo in Syria in 1583.[3] On 5th December 1604, the same ship left Cowes on the Isle of Wight as part of a fleet bound for the orient.[4] One of the ships in the fleet, the *Tiger's Whelp*, lost sight of the rest of the fleet in a tempest and was parted therefrom, but subsequently found its way back to them.[5] On 27th June 1606, the *Tiger* and others sailed back into Milford Haven.[6] The specific mention of Aleppo and the *Tiger* is connected to the "Barke" that "cannot be lost, / Yet it shall be Tempest-tost", which appears to be a reference to the *Tiger's Whelp*. But the astonishing, eerily precise, and surprising detail is that the span of 5th December 1604 to 27th June 1606 is 567 days, which is exactly the same as the "Seu'nights, nine times nine", seven times nine times nine, that the Weird Sister refers to.[7] This dates this opening section of the play to after 27th June 1606.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2003e). Macbeth. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxxiii, Shakespeare, William (1997). Macbeth. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge. p.6, and Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.62. [2] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Tragedies. p.132. [3] Shakespeare, William (2005f). Macbeth. Rutter, Carol Chillington (ed.), Penguin. p.109. [4] Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.62. [5] Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.62. [6] Shakespeare, William (2003e). Macbeth. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxxiii, Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.61, Shakespeare, William (1997). Macbeth. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge. p.6. [7] Shakespeare, William (2003e). Macbeth. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxxiii.

§ There is no indication of how widespread the news of the *Tiger* was apart from the reference in *Macbeth*.[1] Shakespeare had referred to a ship called the *Tiger* before, for example, in *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*,[2] but not with the triple link of a previous

voyage destination, travails of a ship in the same fleet, and exact voyage duration, all during a period to which the play is already related due, in this case due to the Garnet link. It is thought that Middleton later adapted *Macbeth*, so it is important to establish whether this reference is part of the original play or part of an addition.[3] Forman saw the Weird Sisters at the Globe on 20th April 1611, and by the admission of the editors of Middleton's *Collected Works* there is no reason to believe that Middleton had made his revisions to *Macbeth* by that date, or even for several years thereafter. It is also implausible that an event such as this one should be referred to in a play when the event is no longer topical.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1997). Macbeth. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge. p.6. [2] Shakespeare, William (2003e). Macbeth. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios. p.xxxiii. [3] Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008b). Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works. p.1172 contains an edition of *Macbeth* with the supposed additions by Middleton marked. One of the Middleton sections is the speech of the Weird Sisters, including all of the references to the *Tiger*. Yet in the companion volume, Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008a). Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture. p.384, the *Tiger* evidence is used for dating the play in a section which deliberately excludes any scenes thought to be by Middleton. Furthermore, Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.62 says that the *Tiger* section, and the Porter's monologue for that matter, does not look "like an addition", and that it has "essential dramatic relevance". The attribution to Middleton is surprising, therefore, and likely in error.

§ There are a few possible external literary sources and allusions for dating *Macbeth*. Matthew Gwinne wrote *Tres Sibyllae*, the Three Sibyls, to welcome James to St. John's College, Oxford, on 27th August 1605.[1] The three weird sisters or sibyls were a well known part of the story of Duncan and Macbeth from, for example, Holinshed, and James thought himself to be descended from Banquo. That Gwinne should use the characters to welcome James shows that it was considered perspicacious to do so.

The *Gesta Romanorum* of 1606 contains a story about a "queenly" lady who murders an innocent person, and whose hand is stained by the blood of her victim. She cannot remove the stain, until she makes confession to a priest whereupon the stain disappears.[2] Whether this has any connection to *Macbeth* is difficult to say, but the parallel is close enough to warrant noting.

Also in 1606, William Warner's *A Continuance of Albions England* was published, containing a chapter on "Makbeth the Tyrant".[3] Though Macbeth murdered his way to the throne, Holinshed does report that once he was on the throne he was a peaceful and judicious ruler. Warner paints him in colours distinctly less flattering, but of course this would have been politically sensible under the reign of James.[4] There is no need to connect this with Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, but again the circumstance is notable, at the very least because it shows that in 1606 people were referring to the historical Macbeth as a tyrant.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1997). Macbeth. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge. p.5. [2] Kinney, Arthur F. (2001). Lies Like Truth: Shakespeare, Macbeth, and the Cultural Moment. pp.27–8. [3] Shakespeare, William (1997). Macbeth. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge. p.10, Warner, William (1606). A Continuance of Albions England. EEBO, STC 25085. pp.375–8. [4] *Macbeth* itself has also been characterised as a strongly Jacobean play, e.g. by Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.969, due to the Scottish theme, and the portrayal of Banquo, who James I considered to be his ancestor.

§ Of plays that may have been influenced by *Macbeth*, there are three possibilities, and only one of those has any certainty. In *Lingua*, said by Sir John Harington to be by Thomas Tomkis, entered in the Stationers' Register on 23rd February 1607,[1] there is a sleepwalking scene which bears no obvious direct relation to the sleepwalking scene of Lady Macbeth other than the motif.[2] It is not clear when this play was written,[3] so it may even have served as the inspiration for Shakespeare's use of the motif. The sleepwalking scene in *Lingua* is comical rather than tragical:

Mem.
I remember my Lord many haue done so very oft, but
women are troubled, especially with this talking disease, many
of them haue I heard answer in their dreames, and tell what
they did all day awake.

Anam.
By the same token, there was a wanton maide, that
being askt by her Mother, what such a one did with her so late
one night in such a roome, she presently said, that—

Mem.
Peace you vilde rake hell, is such a iest fitte for this
company, no more I say sirra.

Middleton's *The Puritan*, entered in the Stationers' Register on 6th August 1607,[4] contains a scene about a ghost which is, however, strongly related to a pre-1606 scene that Middleton had previously written.[5] The only accepted parallel is in the *Knight of the Burning Pestle* by Francis Beaumont. Unfortunately, this play has proven difficult to date; scholars generally assign it to 1607 or 1608.[6] This at least provides a better latest possible limit than the performance of *Macbeth* seen by Simon Forman on 20th April 1611.

[1] Attribution from EKC ES 3, pp.497–8, Stationers' Register entry from Arber 3, p.148b / 340. [2] Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.64. [3] EKC ES 3, p.498 says perhaps 1602, but perhaps after Macbeth too. 1602 is referred to in the past tense in 3.5, "I remember about the yeare 1602. many vsed this skew kind of language", but of course this may have been a jocular reference to the current year. [4] Arber 3, p.157b / 358. [5] Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.64. [6] Shakespeare, William (2008i). Macbeth. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford. p.64.

§ King Christian IV of Denmark, the brother-in-law of James, visited England between 17th July 1606 and 11th August 1606.[1] On 31st July, Christian IV and James went on procession through the streets of London, and came to Cheapside where a pageant had been constructed. The principal figures of the pageant were Concord, Peace, and Unity, and a Latin speech by John Marston was read which emphasised the figures and used them to express peace amongst all Christian rulers.[2] The patriotic assembled crowd were perhaps not keen on the expression of peace with nations that England had been at war with, such as Spain; at any rate they became loud and unruly.[3] Shakespeare had worked with Marston on the *Poetical Essays* in 1601. The riot at Cheapside may be referred to in *Macbeth* when Malcolm says in Act 4.3:[4]

Nay, had I power, I should
Pour the sweet milk of concord into hell,
Uproar the universal peace, confound
All unity on earth.

The King's Men staged three plays for Christian IV, and were paid the usual sum of £10 for each of them. Braunmuller argues that if one of the plays were *Macbeth*, then extra equipment would have been required to perform it, and they would have been paid more.[5] This does not seem plausible, but there is no apparent evidence that specifically disproves it. The theatres closed in July 1606 due to plague, just before the performances for Christian IV.[6] If *Macbeth* had been ready for the visit, then there is no obvious reason why it would not have been performed for Christian IV. There is a reference to the Scots making war against the Danes in Holinshed which is excised at the beginning of *Macbeth* where it might be expected to appear; it has been suggested that this was in deference to Christian IV.[7] The reference to Concord, Peace, and Unity comes at the end of the play, and it has even been suggested that it was a later insertion.[8]

The Garnet and *Tiger* references are integrated enough to place *Macbeth* after 3rd May and 27th June 1606. The addition of a plausible reference to the pageant event on 31st July links the composition of the play to three consecutive months, all three of which immediately precede the performances for Christian IV. It is impossible to say whether it was finished for these performances, but if the visit was known for at least a few months in advance, it is quite possible that it was written for the occasion. Shakespeare was a writer for the *King's* Men, and this was a visit where the King's brother-in-law was being entertained. If the play was at least started before July 1606, then apart from court performances it may have seemed as though *Macbeth* was a somewhat wasted effort, the theatres remaining shut perhaps all the way through to April 1608. This, and subsequent further closures, may explain why *Macbeth* was being performed at the Globe in 1611, and may explain at least why there was no immediate quarto. For Beaumont to have alluded to the play in 1607 or 1608 suggests that he knew about it, but Beaumont was a prominent playwright and was socially integrated enough that he may have read the play in manuscript. Summer 1606 is a very strong date for *Macbeth*, but the precise circumstances are elusive.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1997). Macbeth. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge. p.8. [2] McManaway, James G. (1949). The Year's Contributions to Shakespearian Study: Textual Studies. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 2. p.148. [3] General facts from Dover Wilson, John (1952). Review of The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, Why, and How it was Written by Shakespeare. Review of English

Studies, 3.12. Review of a work by Henry N. Paul. p.388. [4] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Tragedies. p.146, . [5] Shakespeare, William (1997). Macbeth. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge. p.8. [6] Shakespeare, William (2004c). Pericles. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden. p.55. [7] Dover Wilson, John (1952). Review of The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, Why, and How it was Written by Shakespeare. Review of English Studies, 3.12. Review of a work by Henry N. Paul. p.387. [8] McManaway, James G. (1949). The Year's Contributions to Shakespearian Study: Textual Studies. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 2. p.148.

c.1606 — *Antony and Cleopatra* is written.

§ On 20th May 1608, Edward Blount entered two works in the Stationers' Register. One was "The booke of Pericles Prynce of Tyre", and the other was "A booke Called. Anthony. & Cleopatra."[1] As no edition of either *Pericles* or *Antony and Cleopatra* from that year by Blount survives, it is assumed that he did not publish them, and that these entries may have been blocking entries, preventing other publishers from printing their own editions.[2] Nonetheless, one of Blount's rivals did print *Pericles* soon thereafter, though no edition of *Antony and Cleopatra* is known until the First Folio. Sixteen plays "not formerly entered to other men" were registered to Blount and Jaggard the younger for the First Folio, one of which was *Antony and Cleopatra*, and it is surprising that the play should need to have been registered again to someone that it was already registered to. Notwithstanding the fact that Blount's decision not to print, and his later entry of the same play, make this evidence less than straightforward, scholars generally accept that the 1608 Stationers' Register entry was for the received plays *Pericles* and *Antony and Cleopatra* by Shakespeare.[3] This means that *Antony and Cleopatra* can have been written in early 1608 at the latest.

[1] Arber 3, p.167b / 378. Cf. Shakespeare, William (1995). Antony and Cleopatra. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden. p.70, Shakespeare, William (2008c). Antony and Cleopatra. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.20, Shakespeare, William (2005a). Antony and Cleopatra. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Cambridge. p.1. [2] Shakespeare, William (1995). Antony and Cleopatra. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden. p.70, Shakespeare, William (2005a). Antony and Cleopatra. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Cambridge. p.1. Perhaps, though, the editions simply do not survive, as with many other texts from the era, such as *Love's Labour's Won*, *Macdobeth*, *John of Gaunt*, *A Winter's Night's Pasttime*, and *The Isle of Dogs*. [3] All from Shakespeare, William (2005a). Antony and Cleopatra. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Cambridge. p.1.

§ In 1594, Samuel Daniel wrote his *Cleopatra* on the lives of Antony and Cleopatra. A revision of this work was printed in 1599, and a further revision in 1607.[1] The 1607 revision shows many signs of being influenced by Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*. Scholars have noticed many small verbal parallels,[2] and these are accompanied by three larger parallels. The first is that Shakespeare has Antony call Eros a "late enfranchis'd servant", which is a detail not mentioned in Shakespeare and Daniel's common source, North's translation of Plutarch, but in Daniel the 1607 revision has Antony talk to Eros about the time "When I did make thee free".[3] Secondly, the scene where Antony is hoisted up to Cleopatra is much expanded in Daniel's 1607 version:

She draws him up in rolls of taffeta
T'a window at the top [...]
There Charmion, and poor Eras, two weak maids
Foretir'd with watching, and their mistress' care,
Tugg'd at the pulley, having n'other aids,
And up they hoise [hoist or hoisted] the swooning body there
Of pale Antonius, show'ring out his blood
On th'underlookers, which there gazing stood.

The striking nature of this image has led Rees to suggest that this was based on Daniel's seeing Shakespeare's play staged with this device, and then incorporating this image from it within his own work.[4] The third parallel is that Daniel introduces several characters in his 1607 version which are to be found in Shakespeare's version, including Dircetus, Diomedes, and Gallus.[5] Daniel relied on other Shakespearean works, including *Henry V*, in the collection in which he also published his *Cleopatra* in 1607,[6] and one may ask what possible motivation he had for updating *Cleopatra* in ways so close to Shakespeare's work besides the impetus of that play.[7] It is not known when in 1607 Daniel was revising his work,[8] but these correspondences constrain the date of *Antony and Cleopatra* from the year of the Stationers' Register entry, 1608, into 1607 at the latest.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2008c). Antony and Cleopatra. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.17, and Campbell, Julie D. (2006). Literary Circles and Gender in Early Modern Europe. p.149 in an interesting piece. [2] Shakespeare, William (1995). Antony and Cleopatra. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden.

pp.71–2 claims that the small verbal parallels do not amount to much. Shakespeare, William (2005a). Antony and Cleopatra. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Cambridge. p.1 and Shakespeare, William (2008c). Antony and Cleopatra. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.17 on the other hand mention the parallels with more enthusiasm. [3] Shakespeare, William (1995). Antony and Cleopatra. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden. p.71. [4] Dillon, Janette (2007). The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies. p.126. [5] Shakespeare, William (2008c). Antony and Cleopatra. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.21. [6] Shakespeare, William (1995). Antony and Cleopatra. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden. p.71. [7] Shakespeare, William (2005a). Antony and Cleopatra. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Cambridge. p.1 and Shakespeare, William (2008c). Antony and Cleopatra. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.21–2. [8] Shakespeare, William (1995). Antony and Cleopatra. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden. p.71 says that "Daniel's Senecan tragedy, which had first appeared in 1594, was reissued three times with minor alterations and then published with extensive revisions in his *Certaine Small Workes* some time (exactly when is not known) in 1607." Wilders also seems to imply that R. H. Case in 1906 was the first to point out the parallels with Daniel.

§ *The Devil's Charter* by Barnabe Barnes was performed by the King's Men on 2nd February 1607, and printed in the same year.[1] This play has Cleopatra apply "aspiks" to her breasts, rather than to her arms as was the classical tradition. Wilders argues that this was a well known non-classical tradition in the 16th century.[2] Neill, on the other hand, argues strongly that this motif was first introduced onto the stage by Shakespeare, and that there are other parallels between Shakespeare and Barnes's language reinforcing the connection. The 1607 title page of *The Devil's Charter*, which was printed after 16th October 1607, calls the play "revised, corrected, and augmented".[3] Chambers argued against the "aspiks" section being part of the revisions, which Neill cites,[4] and Bevington holds the same without mentioning Chambers.[5]

If the argument that Barnes was following Shakespeare is correct, and if the section is not part of the possible revisions, then this would push Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* into 1606. The theatres were closed due to plague between July and December 1606, for all of 1607 apart from around May to July or August, and in 1608 until April;[6] J. Leeds Barroll argues that they were probably still closed throughout December 1606.[7] Samuel Daniel could have seen *Antony and Cleopatra* on stage between May and July or August 1607, if he revised and published his work after that date. Barnabe Barnes would have to have seen it before July 1606, or in December 1606 at court though this is unlikely for one outside courtly circles.[8] Since

he was writing for the King's Men, Barnes may have had access to the play in manuscript.[9]

[1] Performance, Shakespeare, William (1995). Antony and Cleopatra. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden. p.73; printing, Shakespeare, William (2008c). Antony and Cleopatra. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.21. [2] Both from Shakespeare, William (1995). Antony and Cleopatra. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden. p.73. [3] Both from Shakespeare, William (2008c). Antony and Cleopatra. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.21. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.995 seem to concur, as they say that *The Devil's Charter* suggests that "Shakespeare wrote his play no later than 1606, and stylistic evidence supports that date." [4] EKC F&P2, pp.476–8, cited by Shakespeare, William (2008c). Antony and Cleopatra. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford. p.21. [5] Shakespeare, William (2005a). Antony and Cleopatra. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Cambridge. pp.1–2. [6] Shakespeare, William (2004c). Pericles. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden. p.55. Cf. July 1606. [7] Barroll, John Leeds (1991). Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater. p.156. [8] Compare, for example, a "play staged at Court was attended by the rich and powerful, brilliantly attired, several hundred in number. Middleton would probably not have been invited." in Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008b). Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works. p.78. [9] Perhaps the fact that the public theatre was only open for a week in the year after *Antony and Cleopatra* goes some way to explaining why the First Folio version of the play is clearly an authorial rather than prompt book copy of the play. But it is fair to assume that the King's Men would have performed in the provinces.

3rd March 1606 — Sir William Davenant is baptised in Oxford, and reports in later life that Shakespeare was his godfather.

* Aubrey, John (1982). Brief Lives. Barber, Richard W. (ed.). p.90. Originally written before 1697.

24th March 1606 — The King's Men are paid for the performance of ten plays at court over the Christmas period, with John Heminges receiving the money.

* EKC F&P2, p.333.

20th April 1606 — Susanna Shakespeare and others miss the Easter sacrament.

* SS CDL, p.286.

6th May 1606 — Susanna Shakespeare and others are charged for not receiving the Easter sacrament.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.235. Cf. SS CDL, p.286.

July 1606 — The theatres close, probably remaining closed until May 1607, in the start of a series of closures over the next few years.

§ There was a rule that if plague deaths climbed over thirty during a particular week, the theatres would be closed. Whether this rule was always observed is uncertain,[1] but certainly higher death counts would imply a higher chance of closure. In 1606, the figure was exceeded in mid July. In September, 100 people per week were dying from the plague, whereas in November it briefly fell back under the thirty limit. The theatres may have opened again briefly, but they would have been closed again in December since in the first week they rose to over 45, which was highly unusual in cold weather. The unusual nature of the spike may have meant they remained closed through early 1607 when the figures were always around 30, sometimes slightly under and sometimes slightly over; and they would have been closed for Lent towards the end of February anyway. In May 1607 they could have opened again, and would have closed again in July or August of the same year, again due to plague.[2] They had opened again by 29th March 1608, as the French ambassador reported on that day that they had once again been closed on account of offensive performances.[3] The child company at Blackfriars had caused the offence, causing James I to declare that they should "never play more but should first beg their bread".[4] The Blackfriars opened again in April 1608.[5] The theatres were closed in late July 1608, when the plague death rate reached fifty in a week,[6] and opened again over a year later, in December 1609.[7]

Summary, with plague death rates in parentheses:

Mid July 1606 — Close (30+)
September 1606 — Still closed (100)
November 1606 — Possibly open and close (less than 30)
Early December 1606 — Closed (45)
January 1607 — Probably closed (c.30)
Late February 1607 — Closed for Lent

May 1607 — Open
July or August 1607 — Close
March 1608 — Open by now, then Close
April 1608 — Open
Late July 1608 — Close (50)
Early December 1609 — Open (less than 30)

[1] Bentley, Gerald Eades (1941). The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. Vol. 2. p.652 notes too that there is evidence that "before 1610 the danger mark was raised to forty", citing *Ram Alley*, a play probably acted in 1607 or 1608 but first recorded for certain in 1610. [2] All from Grote, David (2002). The Best Actors in the World. p.160. Grote gives 10th July 1606 as the start of the mid July week, but this was a Thursday in the Julian calendar, so perhaps Grote was using a proleptic Gregorian calendar, in which it is a Monday. [3] EKC ES 2, pp.53–4. Kastan, David Scott (2006). The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature. Vol. 1. Entry: George Chapman. p.436 says that the complaint was raised on 8 April 1608. Van Es, Bart (2013). Shakespeare in Company. p.257 dates the performance itself, rather than the complaint, to March. [4] Van Es, Bart (2013). Shakespeare in Company. p.257. [5] Shakespeare, William (2004c). Pericles. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden. p.55. [6] According to Murray, John Tucker (1910). English Dramatic Companies, 1558–1642. Vol. 1. p.151, the figure in the week starting 28th July 1608 was fifty. This was a Thursday in the Julian calendar. [7] George, David (2000). Plutarch, Insurrection, and Dearth. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 53. p.71, where the count is said to have fallen below 30 from 7th December 1609. Cites Leeds Barroll, J. (1991). Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater. pp.225–6 and p.242. 7th December 1609 was a Thursday in the Julian calendar.

July 1606 — The King's Men are paid for performing at Oxford between 28th July and 31st July.

[*] EKC F&P2, p.333. These dates are correct if the order of the entries in the Oxford records are chronological, since there is no date against the specific entry, only against the surrounding entries. That the King's Men would be performing in the provinces just after the London theatres closed in mid July would of course make sense.

1st August 1606 — A survey of Rowington Manor lists Shakespeare's Chapel Lane cottage.

[*] EKC F&P2, p.112.

7th August 1606 — The King's Men are paid for the performance of three plays at Greenwich and Hampton Court for James I and the King of Denmark, with John Heminges receiving the money.

* EKC F&P2, p.333.

30th October 1606 — Mary Mountjoy, with whom Shakespeare was residing as a lodger a few years earlier, is buried.

* SS R&I, p.24.

26th December 1606 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

29th December 1606 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

1607

1607 — William Barkstead refers to Shakespeare by name in *Mirrha, the Mother of Adonis*.

* Barkstead, William (1607). Mirrha, the Mother of Adonis. EEBO, STC 1429. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.175.

c.1607 — *Pericles* is written, by George Wilkins and Shakespeare.

§ George Wilkins wrote the beginning of *Pericles*, and Shakespeare wrote the end. The division of labour was approximately that Wilkins wrote the first two acts, and that Shakespeare wrote the remaining three acts. There is some debate about the specific details involved, but no debate about this general scheme.[1] The first work published by Wilkins was a translation of the *History of Justine*, published in 1606 by William Jaggard.[2] This work features leading characters from *Pericles*, including Pericles himself and Antiochus the Great.[3] He also wrote, probably in 1606 but at least by mid 1607, the *Miseries of Enforced Marriage* as the sole author, and the majority of *Travels of the Three English Brothers* with John Day and William Rowley; both of these works are plays.[4] A further work by Wilkins, a pamphlet on the *Three Miseries of Barbary*, is undated, but was probably published in 1606, or more likely 1607, according to Guy Shepherd Greene.[5]

[1] All from Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.4, and Shakespeare, William (2004c). Pericles. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden. p.68. [2] Wilkins, George (1606). The Historie of Iustine. EEBO, STC 24293. [3] Vickers, Brian (2004). Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays. p.143. [4] That his was a majority share comes from Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.5. [5] Greene, Guy Shepard (1924). A New Date for George Wilkins's Three Miseries of Barbary. Modern Language Notes, 39.5. pp.285–291.

§ The *Miseries of Enforced Marriage* was the only play that Wilkins wrote by himself.[1] It is said to have been a great popular success,[2] and was probably performed before 1607. The title page of the 1607 quarto says "As it is now playd by his Maiesties Seruants", the King's Men.[3] Gary Taylor thinks that it was written some time between June 1605 and May 1606,[4] before the theatres closed in July 1606 due to plague. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on 31st July 1607.[5] The *Travels of the Three English Brothers* was

entered in the Stationers' Register on 29th June 1607,[6] the month before *Miseries*, and three weeks before a tract on the same subject by Anthony Nixon.[7] The Nixon tract, which commended the Sherley family about whom the play was also written, shows influence of the play, and was also published in 1607.[8] Since both play and tract are positive propaganda for the family, it is likely that the family was to some extent behind both works, and this suggests that the *Three English Brothers* was written closer to the Nixon tract, and after *Miseries*. The Stationers' Register entry for *Three English Brothers* says, "as yt was played at the Curten", and the title page, "As it is now play'd by her Majesties Servants",[9] i.e. the Queen's Men who probably performed it at the Curtain.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.4. [2] Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.5. [3] Wilkins, George (1607). The Miseries of Inforst Mariage. EEBO, STC 25635. [4] Taylor, Gary (1982). A New Source and an Old Date for King Lear. Review of English Studies, Vol. 33. pp.396–413, cited in Shakespeare, William (2004c). Pericles. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden. p.55. [5] Arber 3, p.157 / 357. [6] Arber 3, p.155b / 354. [7] Parr, Anthony (ed.) (1995). Three Renaissance Travel Plays. p.55. [8] Jowitt, Claire (2010). The Culture of Piracy, 1580–1630. p.138, who says the play "was clearly intended by Thomas Sherley — Anthony and Robert's England-based elder brother — to rehabilitate the family's reputations since it was performed and published in 1607 virtually simultaneously with Anthony Nixon's pamphlet account of the brothers' adventures, *The Three English Brothers*." [9] Both from Parr, Anthony (ed.) (1995). Three Renaissance Travel Plays. p.55.

§ Before mid 1607, then, George Wilkins had translated a history and written two plays, one for the King's Men and the other for the Queen's Men. The theatres had been closed from late July 1606 due to plague. They may have opened in November 1606, and, less likely, in January and early February 1607, but were then closed until May 1607. They only reopened until July or August 1607, and were then closed again until April 1608. They closed in late July 1608, and opened in December 1609. The easiest way to think about this long period of theatre closures is that the theatres were shut from mid 1606 to the end of 1609, with minor openings. In other words, they were closed for half of 1606, and all of 1607, 1608, and 1609, except for reasonable openings during May to July or August 1607, and April to July 1608. The theatres were closed for three and a half years, with only short summer seasons in 1607 and 1608.[1]

Since the title page of the 1607 quarto of the *Miseries of Enforced Marriage* says it is *now* played by the King's Men, and since the Stationers' Register entry for that is from 31st July 1607, it was probably published just before the theatres were shut again in the short playing season in 1607, unless it refers to the company acting the play in the provinces. The same goes for the *Travels of the Three English Brothers*, whose title page from 1607 says that it was currently being acted by the Queen's Men. The Stationers' Register entry for it says that it was performed at the Curtain, in the past tense; perhaps it is reading too much from that to suggest a pre July 1606 performance date for the play? Gary Taylor suggests such a date for the *Miseries of Enforced Marriage*.

When the theatres were open in mid 1607, it is a strong and reasonable assumption that Shakespeare had been attending the marriage of his daughter Susanna to Dr. John Hall in Stratford on 5th June.[2] He was probably not back in London by 16th July, because Ben Jonson, who was not particularly in favour in this period, was called on to write a piece for the King's Men.[3] With Thomas Dekker, Wilkins wrote *Jests to Make You Merrie*,[4] entered in the Stationers' Register on 6th October 1607 and printed in the same year.[5] Also in 1607, though what part of the year specifically is unknown, the main source for the story in *Pericles*, the *Pattern of Painful Adventures* by Lawrence Twine, originally printed in 1594, was printed in a new edition by Valentine Simmes.[6]

[1] Q.v. July 1606. [2] EKC F&P2, p.4. [3] Suggested in Grote, David (2002). The Best Actors in the World. p.163. [4] Dekker, Thomas and Wilkins, George (1607). Iests to Make you Merie. EEBO, STC 6541. Also mentioned in Vickers, Brian (2004). Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays. p.143. [5] Arber 3, p.158b / 360. Cf. Clegg, Cyndia Susan (2008). King Lear and Early Seventeenth-Century Print Culture. In: Kahan, Jeffrey (ed.). King Lear: New Critical Essays. p.167. [6] Twine, Lawrence (1594). The Patterne of Painefull Aduentures. EEBO, STC 709 for the 1594 edition. Twine, Lawrence (1607). The Patterne of Paineful Aduentures. EEBO, STC 710 for the 1607 version.

§ One common thread which runs through works by Wilkins is a love of the Mediterranean. The translation of the *History of Justine* (1606), the play the *Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607) for the Queen's Men, and the pamphlet the *Three Miseries of Barbary* (1607?) are all based on Mediterranean themes.[1] The fact that the source story for *Pericles*, the *Pattern of Painful Adventures* by Twine, was published in 1607 has led naturally to the question of whether the printing inspired the play, or the play

inspired the printing.[2] Though it has been noticed that Wilkins was an enthusiast of the Mediterranean, this fact does not seem to have previously been used to answer the question of precedence. It is reasonable to assume that Wilkins would have picked a Mediterranean topic for his next play for the King's Men no matter what was coming from the presses, and though it may have been a nice coincidence for him that Twine was reprinted in 1607, it seems more likely that Wilkins would have picked the subject after having translated the pieces about Pericles in the *History of Justine*. Since *Pericles* uses the Mediterranean theme, and since Wilkins wrote the start of the play, it is also more likely that Wilkins came up with the idea than that Shakespeare did.

Pericles was a wildly popular play: it was referred to as such in *Pimlico* in 1609,[3] and the quarto, despite being a reported text, went through more quarto editions than any other Shakespearean play except for *Richard II* and *1 Henry IV*.[4] Gossett, on the subject of whether *Pericles* precedes Twine or vice versa, notes that since the former was staged in a period when the theatres were mainly closed due to the plague, and yet since it was so popular, the publication of Twine was one move to satisfy the popular demand for the subject created by the play.[5] This suggests, then, that *Pericles* was performed and popular before the end of 1607 (in the Old Style calendrical reckoning, depending however on the accuracy of the title page of Twine); for it to have been performed before March 1608, which is the end of the Old Style 1607 year, it would have had to have been performed between May and July or August 1607. This means that *Pericles* must have been written by July 1607 at the latest. Shakespeare was, however, probably in Stratford for all of June. Therefore, *Pericles* was probably written before June 1607.

[1] Vickers, Brian (2004). Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays. p.143, and Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.5. [2] Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.38. [3] Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.38. [4] Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.1. [5] Gossett, Suzanne (2003). "You not your child well loving": Text and Family Structure in Pericles. In: Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (eds.). A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Vol. 4. p.351.

§ It is possible that *Pericles* was written in 1606, but in the middle part of that year Shakespeare was working on *Macbeth*, and in the same year he also wrote *Antony and Cleopatra*. It is unclear whether he wrote *Antony and Cleopatra* before or after *Macbeth*;

before may be most likely. Either way, Shakespeare wrote two whole plays by himself in that year, which is extraordinary in his career after 1599. For him to have written three plays in the same year is not impossible, as he did so in 1599 for example, but the pattern of his career is that he wrote on average two plays per year before *Hamlet*, and one play per year after.[1] Three plays in one year followed by no plays in a year would be strange, so it is more likely that Wilkins wrote both of his plays in 1606, and then collaborated with Shakespeare in 1607.

[1] 23 from 1590 to 1599 inclusive, 23/10 years. 18 from 1600 to 1613 inclusive, 17/14 years. Averages of 2.3 per year from 1590–1599, and 1.2 per year from 1600–1613.

§ There is further evidence that *Pericles* was written in 1607. In a deposition given in 1612, Shakespeare is said to have known the Mountjoy family for about ten years, and to have resided with them as a lodger at their home in Silver Street. George Wilkins also gave evidence in the same case, and is said to have known the Mountjoy family since 1607.[1] This implies two important pieces of information. (1) Shakespeare may still have been lodging with the Mountjoy family in 1607. (2) Shakespeare may have introduced Wilkins to the Mountjoy family socially; for example Wilkins may have visited Shakespeare in Silver Street. If Wilkins was writing for the King's Men in 1606, then the sequence of events is more clear: that he became socially involved with Shakespeare through his work for the King's Men, rather than that Shakespeare knew him and then he became involved with the King's Men. Coupled with the evidence of the relative workload of each poet, and the reprint of Twine in 1607, it seems very likely that *Pericles* was written in the early part of 1607, perhaps not long before the theatres opened for the short summer season, or even after the opening.

[1] Vickers, Brian (2004). Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays. p.143, and Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.7.

§ *Pericles* was entered in the Stationers' Register on 20th May 1608, but was not printed in that year.[1] This was probably Shakespeare's play, which is further evidence that it was written at least before this date early in 1608. The play was printed in two quarto editions in 1609, but these are bad quartos, with reported texts.[2] The Stationers' Register entry was to Edward Blount: "Edw Blount. Entred for his copie vnder thand[es] of S^{r} Geo. Buck knight & M^{r} Warden Seton A booke called. The booke

of Pericles prynce of Tyre vj[d] [strike. R]".[3] The quartos, however, were printed by William White and Thomas Creede for Henry Gosson.[4] The quarto text, then, may not be the same one that Blount presumably possessed and intended to print based on the 1608 entry.[5] It is not clear why Blount did not print the text, and no good text of *Pericles* was ever printed.[6] In 1608, however, a summary of the play specifically said to be a report of the story staged by the King's Men was published under the title *The Painful Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre*. The author was George Wilkins.[7]

The publication of the story of the play by Wilkins may indicate, like the publication of the new edition of Twine, that popular demand for the play made it profitable to publish anything available about *Pericles*. Wilkins may not have been able to submit the text of the play itself for publication since it was owned by the King's Men, and since they may not have been happy about the publication of a text for such a popular play. But why then was Blount apparently going to publish the text? And why did he not? The entry has been called a blocking entry, stopping other publishers from printing the text. More recently it has been argued that blocking entries are a "canard", and that Blount may simply have been uninterested in the play, finding that it did not fit with his line.[8] This reasoning is specious if the publishing success of works by Twine and Wilkins are an indication of the huge popularity of the play. If the blocking theory is wrong, then it may be that Blount did not have a good text of the play; that in fact he had a bad text, either the one which somehow made its way to White and Creede for Gosson instead, or another. But since White and Creede printed the bad quarto, and in two editions in one year showing how popular it must have been, then that still does not explain why Blount did not even publish a bad quarto. So we go back to the theory that it was a blocking entry. But if it was a blocking entry, it did not stop the two bad quartos being published the next year. The matter is therefore unexplained.

[1] Arber 3, p.167b / 378 for the Stationers' Register entry; and Shakespeare, William (2004c). Pericles. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden. p.16, and Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.38 for not being printed in the same year. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1059 argue that that this was a blocking entry, to try to prevent others from publishing what was an extremely successful play. If so, the blocking failed, because a corrupt quarto was published in 1609. [2] Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.3, and

Shakespeare, William (2008l). Pericles. Giddens, Eugene (ed.), Penguin. p.xxii. [3] Transcription from Shakespeare, William (2004c). Pericles. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden. p.16. [4] Shakespeare, William (1609a). Pericles, Prince of Tyre. EEBO, STC 22334, and Shakespeare, William (1609b). Pericles, Prince of Tyre. EEBO, STC 22335. Bibliographically attributed to Shakespeare, but written with George Wilkins. [5] Gossett, Suzanne (2003). "You not your child well loving": Text and Family Structure in Pericles. In: Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (eds.). A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Vol. 4. p.351. [6] Shakespeare, William (2008l). Pericles. Giddens, Eugene (ed.), Penguin. p.xxii. [7] Wilkins, George (1608). The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre. EEBO, STC 25638.5, and mentioned in Vickers, Brian (2004). Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays. p.143. [8] Shakespeare, William (2004c). Pericles. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden. pp.16–17, who says that "Blayney himself hypothesizes that Blount may have bought *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Pericles* thinking they would fit his 'line', and, whatever the cause of his failure to print *Antony and Cleopatra*, set *Pericles* aside when he found that it was a rambling romance rather than a work about the Athenian leader". This argument cannot stand in the face of the obvious popularity of *Pericles*.

§ Zorzi (Giorgio) Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador to England, saw *Pericles* during his stay in the country between 5th January 1606 and 13th November 1608. He saw the play with Antoine de la Boderie, who arrived in England on 6th May 1606, and de la Boderie's wife, about whom nothing is heard of before April 1607. They probably therefore saw the play during either the 1607 summer theatre opening, or the 1608 summer opening, but it is not possible to say which is more likely.[1] The 1609 quartos of *Pericles* call it "much admired".[2] The anonymous but amusing *Pimlico*, entered in the Stationers' Register on 15th April 1609,[3] in possible connection with a ballad of the same which was entered on 24th April shortly before they were both transferred to William Barley on 3rd May 1609,[4] praises *Pericles*.[5] Shakespeare went on to refine the techniques of romance culminating in *The Tempest*. Wilkins stopped writing and went on to own a brothel.[6]

[1] All from Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.37. [2] Shakespeare, William (1609a). Pericles, Prince of Tyre. EEBO, STC 22334, and Shakespeare, William (1609b). Pericles, Prince of Tyre. EEBO, STC 22335. Also Shakespeare, William (2008l). Pericles. Giddens, Eugene (ed.), Penguin. p.xxii, which confusingly refers to "the" quarto, as though there were only one edition printed in 1609, rather than two. [3] Arber 3, p.181b / 406. [4] Anon (1891). Pimlyco, or, Runne Red-Cap. Bullen, Arthur Henry (ed.). pp.v–vi. [5] Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.38, and Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.1. [6] Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.6.

§ Regarded as the first Shakespearean tragicomedy, *Pericles* marks a significant change of style in the Shakespearean canon. The subsequent plays which are usually regarded as belonging to the same genre are *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*.[1] In 1901, Ashley H. Thorndike argued that Shakespeare was influenced to switch to this new genre by the works of Beaumont and Fletcher, and that for example *Philaster* by the famous partnership had a direct impact on *Cymbeline*.[2] The onset of tragicomedy on the Jacobean stage was, however, most likely prompted by events abroad. Giovanni Battista Guarini had written a play called *Il Pastor Fido* according to this design, and wrote a defence of it in 1601. Fletcher in turn adapted Guarini's *Pastor* as *The Faithful Shepherd*, and wrote his own defence of tragicomedy based on Guarini.[3] Martin Wiggins, in his treatment of the origins of tragicomedy, ascribes *Shepherd* to the years 1608–9, which clearly post dates *Pericles*. In this case, without any further contextual knowledge, it must be argued that Shakespeare and George Wilkins produced the first recognisably mainstream tragicomic play on the English stage. Early overtones of tragicomedy had been introduced by John Marston into his 1602–3 play *The Malcontent*, but in the opinion of Wiggins this did more to "accelerate the progressive darkening of comedy" than to introduce outright the new genre from Italy.[4] There are also other, earlier English examples of mixed tragedy and comedy, but these seem to have evolved somewhat separately from the great spate of tragicomedy foreshadowed by Marston and starting in the main with Wilkins and Shakespeare, and Beaumont and Fletcher.[5]

[1] Hunt, Maurice (2002). Romance and Tragicomedy. In: Kinney, Arthur F. (ed.). A Companion to Renaissance Drama. p.384. [2] Thorndike, Ashley H. (1901). The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare. pp.5–6. [3] Shakespeare, William (1999). The Tempest. Vaughan, Alden T. and Vaughan, Virginia Mason (eds.), Arden. p.10. Hunt, Maurice (2002). Romance and Tragicomedy. In: Kinney, Arthur F. (ed.). A Companion to Renaissance Drama. p.392 says that the translation of *Il Pastor Fido* came out in 1602, which was a year after the Italian defence. [4] Wiggins, Martin (2000). Shakespeare and the Drama of his Time. pp.106–14. [5] Hunt, Maurice (2002). Romance and Tragicomedy. In: Kinney, Arthur F. (ed.). A Companion to Renaissance Drama. p.392.

4th January 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

[*] EKC F&P2, p.334.

6th January 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

8th January 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

22nd January 1607 — *Romeo and Juliet*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and *The Taming of a Shrew* are transferred from Cuthbert Burby to Nicholas Ling in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.147 / 337, and SS R&I, p.216.

2nd February 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

5th February 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

15th February 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

27th February 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

5th June 1607 — Susanna Shakespeare, William's daughter, marries Dr. John Hall.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.235. EKC F&P2, p.4, and Eccles, p.111.

12th July 1607 — Edward Shakespeare, William's nephew, is baptised in London.

§ "Edward Shakesbye the sonne of Edward Shakesbye was baptized the same daye–morefilds".[1]

[1] Phelps, Wayne H. (1978). Edmund Shakespeare at St. Leonard's, Shoreditch. Shakespeare Quarterly, 29.3. p.422, cited in Lancashire, Ian (1980). Annotated Bibliography of Printed Records of Early British Drama and Minstrelsy for 1978–9. Records of Early English Drama. p.26.

16th July 1607 — Shakespeare was probably not yet back in London after having attended the wedding of his daughter Susanna in June.

* Ben Jonson, who was not then in favour, was called on to write a piece for the King's Men. Grote, David (2002). The Best Actors in the World. p.163 suggests that this means Shakespeare was not yet back in London, though Jonson was probably not the only poet available in London to write a piece for the King's Men. It is still likely that Shakespeare was not around for the baptism of his nephew, Edward, in London.

6th August 1607 — *The Puritan*, which was not written by Shakespeare but is attributed to "W.S.", is entered by George Elde in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.157b / 358, and SS R&I, p.217. Cf. Wickham, Glynne, Berry, Herbert, and Ingram, William (eds.) (2000). English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660. p.308.

12th August 1607 — Edward Shakespeare, William's nephew, dies.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.26. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.18. The original record incorrectly gives his father's name as Edward too, not Edmund, on which cf. Schoenbaum's commentary in SS CDL, p.29.

5th September 1607 — William Keeling records a performance of *Hamlet* aboard his ship, the Dragon, moored off of Sierra Leone.

* EKC F&P2, p.334. Cf. 31st March 1608 for another performance of the same play recorded by Keeling.

30th September 1607 — William Keeling records a performance of *Richard II* aboard his ship, the Dragon.

* EKC F&P2, p.334.

22nd October 1607 — *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*, a King's Men's play, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.159b / 362.

19th November 1607 — *Hamlet*, *The Taming of a Shrew* [sic], *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Love's Labour's Lost* are transferred from Nicholas Ling to John Smethwick in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.161 / 365, and SS R&I, p.217.

26th November 1607 — *King Lear* is entered by Nathaniel Butter and John Busby in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.161b / 366, and facsimiles in SS DL, p.202 and SS R&I, p.218.

17th December 1607 — Mary Hart, daughter of William Hart and Shakespeare's sister Joan, is buried.

* EKC F&P2, p.7.

26th December 1607 — The King's Men play *King Lear* in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335. Chambers does not record the name of the play, but that it is *King Lear* is evident from the title page of Shakespeare, William (1608). True Chronicle Historie of the life and death of King Lear. EEBO, STC 22292. Title page: "As it was played before the Kings Maiestie at Whitehall vpon S. Stephans night in Christmas Hollidayes."

27th December 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

28th December 1607 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

31st December 1607 — Edmund Shakespeare, William's brother, is buried.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.26. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.18.

1608

c.1608 — *Coriolanus* is written.

§ There are several sources for and allusions to *Coriolanus* that point to a 1608 date. These are summarised as events below in separate source and allusion sections. The sources represent earliest ranges, so for example the Blackfriars playhouse was bought in 1608 but was used thereafter, and therefore 1608 represents the earliest possible date for it to be relevant. The allusions represent latest ranges, so for example that *The Woman's Prize* alludes to the play in around 1608 only means that the play must have been written before then; it is more of an indication than a way of precisely giving the date. Taking all of the sources and the allusions into consideration cumulatively provides a clearer picture for dating the play. Since the sources generally run into 1608, and the allusions start from 1608, this year is the most probable year of composition.

Sources and possible sources:

1603 —Camden's *Remains of a Greater Work* circulates?
1605 — Camden's *Remains of a Greater Work* is published
May 1607 — Midland Revolt, peasant revolt, a possible inspiration?
1608 — Reference to Dekker's description of the Thames?
1608–09 — Reference to Sir Hugh Myddelton's canal project?

Parallels and allusions:

c.Late 1608 to Early 1609 — Armin's *Italian Tailor* parallels the play
c.1609 — Jonson's *Epicœne* alludes to the play

§ Camden's *Remains of a Greater Work* was published in 1605, but may have been circulating as early as 1603 since the epistle dedicatory is dated to that year. Shakespeare is mentioned in the work as one of several of the most "pregnant witts of these our times, whom succeeding ages may justly admire."[1] Malone was the first to

point out that the fable of the belly by Menenius in *Coriolanus* was based on a version by Camden in this work, rather than from Plutarch where it also appears.[2]

In May 1607, the counties Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, and Shakespeare's own Warwickshire were home to a Midland Revolt of "common people" who "threaten to resist turning arable land into pasture", as a contemporary source put it.[3] In other words, this was a revolt over enclosure, the attempt by landowners to make more money from their land at the expense of their tenant farmers. This would affect Shakespeare directly from around 5th September 1614 as a great enclosure row started in Stratford itself. The corn shortage in *Coriolanus* may allude to the Midland Revolt, but is also mentioned in Plutarch's *Lives* from which he derived the plot.[4] This is merely a possible allusion, then, not a probable one.

In *The Great Frost*, probably by Thomas Dekker and printed in 1608, the great Thames freeze of December 1607 to January 1608 is described. One of the features was great pans of burning coals for people to warm their fingers by, which may be alluded to in Act 1.1 where Coriolanus says that the citizens are no surer "than is the coal of fire upon the ice".[5] This might be taken as a very weak allusion to *The Great Frost*, but the pans there are sure and do not break through, and help to warm an impromptu yet bustling community on the very solid ice. But Shakespeare lived and worked in London, and is just as likely to have visited the Thames as Dekker.

[1] Camden, William (1605). Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine. EEBO, STC 4521. Certaine Poemes section. p.8. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.127, and Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. p.47–8. [2] Shakespeare, William (2010a). Coriolanus. Bliss, Lee (ed.), Cambridge, 2nd edition. p.1, including the information that Malone was the first to point it out. [3] Steible, Mary (2004). Coriolanus: a Guide to the Play. p.5. [4] Correspondences are noted in, for example, Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1087 and Charnaik, Warren (2011). The Myth of Rome in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries. pp.173–4. Charnaik, however, mentions divergences too where Shakespeare for example shapes a different character for Coriolanus than that presented in his source. [5] All from Steible, Mary (2004). Coriolanus: a Guide to the Play. p.6. The analogy that Steible develops is strained, but confronting the play as a situated text is a noble effort. The Thames freeze was a highly notable event. Steible is certainly more realistic than Shakespeare, William (2010a). Coriolanus. Bliss, Lee (ed.), Cambridge, 2nd edition. p.2, who says that Shakespeare "probably alludes" to this event, though Bliss does point out that it is an unusual image. One may balance this with the "hot ice" from

A Midsummer Night's Dream, or "O cleft effect! cold modesty, hot wrath, / Both fire from hence and chill extincture hath" from *A Lover's Complaint*, showing that Shakespeare's mind was more than capable of unusual images, even of juxtapositions of this very nature.

§ London was a fast growing city in the early 17th century, and despite having the Thames, needed a greater supply of fresh water. Edmund Colthurst came up with the idea of diverting other nearby water sources towards the Thames through a huge new canal, to be known as the New River. In 1604 he obtained letters patent from James to cut this river. In 1605 he had brought the channel forward three miles, at a cost of £700, but it was far from finished, and he ran into financial difficulties. In 1606 he submitted a bill to parliament for continuing the work, but the City was not entirely pleased with the suggestion, and countered with a movement in 1607 to make their own scheme. In October 1608, Colthurst apparently tried to reason with the City, saying that he had many friends on board, probably one of whom was Sir Hugh Myddelton MP, who had taken a keen interest in the project since its going to committee in parliament. The bill had passed its third reading, and the City had decided to assent to Colthurst, but deputed their control to Myddelton, who seems to have acted as a sort of central and unifying figure. They gave Colthurst and Myddelton the go ahead, and between February and May 1609 the work again proceeded. The New River was completed and opened in September 1613, and still exists.[1]

Shakespeare may allude to this scheme in *Coriolanus* Act 3.1, when he asks the patricians if they understand of Sicinius that "hee'l turne your Current in a ditch, / And make your Channell his?"[2] Perhaps the changing of the current alludes to the City passing control of the project from Colthurst to Myddelton? But if Myddelton was one of Colthurst's friends, this would not seem such a terrible development for Colthurst. As the scheme was so long in the development, it is difficult to say when an allusion would be most likely if not to this particular event of passing the control over, but certainly there was a lot of debate and activity about the scheme in late 1608 and early 1609. Unfortunately, then, this is a weak indication for use in dating the play, though one worth noting.

[1] Almost entirely summarised from the excellent work of Skempton, in Skempton, A. W. (2002). A Biographical Dictionary of Civil Engineers in Great Britain and Ireland. pp.147–8, under Colthurst, Edmund—except for the matter of the work starting again, which Skempton places in May 1609, and

Shakespeare, William (2010a). Coriolanus. Bliss, Lee (ed.), Cambridge, 2nd edition. p.3 places on 20 February 1609—and influence from several other works on the subject. [2] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Tragedies. p.15.

§ The earliest easily datable allusion to *Coriolanus* is in a work by Robert Armin, a comic actor and long time member of the King's Men. Coriolanus says that men "threw their caps / As they would hang them on the hornes a'th Moone".[1] In the epistle to the reader in *The Italian Tailor and his Boy*, whose title page bears the date 1609, Armin writes of a "strange time of taxation, wherein euery Pen & inck-horne Boy will throw vp his Cap at the hornes of the Moone in censure".[2] There have been the usual range of suggestions to account for the evidence: that it stuck in Armin's mind because he played Menenius, whom Coriolanus is addressing; that he played someone else in the scene; even that he did not get the image from Shakespeare at all.[3] It may be difficult to ascertain the direction of the allusion, as Shakespeare may certainly have read a book by one of his colleagues. That the image is more Shakespearean than Arminian ought to be granted as at least a plausible opinion. *Phantasma, or The Italian Tailor and his Boy* was entered in the Stationers' Register to Thomas Pavier on 6th February 1609.[4] This means that the book was probably written in 1608 to 1609, and the prefatory epistle is undated and could have been written in either year. This suggests that *Coriolanus* was written before February 1609. It was probably written at least some months earlier to meet the court performance season.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Tragedies. p.2. [2] Armin, Robert (1609). The Italian Tailor and his Boy. EEBO, STC Reel 867:14. Sig. A4r. This work is also referred to as *Phantasma*, which does not appear on the title page of the EEBO version. [3] Shakespeare, William (2010a). Coriolanus. Bliss, Lee (ed.), Cambridge, 2nd edition. p.1. [4] Arber 3, p.179 / 401.

§ Ben Jonson parodies a line from *Coriolanus* in his *Epicœne*, which was first staged in late 1609 or early 1610. John Ripley argues that the joke would require a "thoroughgoing knowledge of *Coriolanus* on the part of the audience", and that since the theatres were closed from July 1608 to December 1609, "playgoers probably saw *Coriolanus* for the first time in late in December 1609 or sometime in January 1610."[1]

Yet Ripley gives no reason why they cannot have seen it for the first time in 1608 before the playhouses were shut, and again in 1609 and on into 1610.

[1] Ripley, John (1998). Coriolanus on stage in England and America, 1609–1994. p.34. He does not mention, and does not seem to know about, the date of the Stationers' Register entry for Armin's book.

2nd January 1608 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

6th January 1608 — The King's Men perform twice in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

7th January 1608 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

9th January 1608 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

17th January 1608 — The King's Men perform twice in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

26th January 1608 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

2nd February 1608 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

7th February 1608 — The King's Men perform in front of James I at Whitehall.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

21st February 1608 — Elizabeth Hall, daughter of Susanna and Dr. John Hall, is baptised.

* EKC F&P2, p.7.

§ In April 1624, Elizabeth travelled to London, at the age of sixteen. She arrived back in Stratford on 22nd April 1624, only to fall ill and have to be treated by her father.[1] The trip at a young age raises the possibility that Susanna or Judith, Shakespeare's daughters, could have travelled to London with or to see their father at a similar age. Susanna, for example, was 16 years old in 1599, the year that Shakespeare wrote *Henry V*, *Julius Caesar*, and *As You Like It*.

[1] Joseph, Harriet (1976). John Hall: Man and Physician. pp.32–3.

31st March 1608 — William Keeling records another performance of *Hamlet* aboard his ship.

* EKC F&P2, p.335. Cf. 5th September 1607.

2nd May 1608 — *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, credited in the Stationers' Register entry and on the title page to Shakespeare but actually written by Thomas Middleton, is entered by Thomas Pavier in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.167 / 377, and SS R&I, p.218.

20th May 1608 — Edward Blount enters *Pericles* and *Antony and Cleopatra* in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.167b / 378, and SS R&I, pp.218–9.

1st July 1608 — Richard Shakespeare, William's brother, is brought before the ecclesiastical court of Stratford on a now unknown charge.

* Brinkworth, E. R. C. (1972). Shakespeare and the Bawdy Court of Stratford. p.110.

28th July 1608 — The London theatres close due to plague, and do not reopen until December 1609.

* According to Murray, John Tucker (1910). English Dramatic Companies, 1558–1642. Vol. 1. p.151, the figure for plague deaths in the week starting 28th July 1608 was fifty which was enough for the theatres to be closed.

9th August 1608 — The leases transferring the Blackfriars theatre to the King's Men were formally executed.

* Bentley, Gerald Eades (1948). Shakespeare and the Blackfriars Theatre. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 1. p.42. Cf. also EKC ES 2, p.509–10 who does not give the exact date.

16th August 1608 — William Sly of the King's Men is buried in St. Leonard's Church, in Shoreditch.

* Honigmann, E. A. J. and Brock, Susan (1993). Playhouse Wills, 1558–1642. p.81.

17th August 1608 — Shakespeare starts a lawsuit against John Addenbrooke, pursuing him in the Stratford Court of Record for the debt of £6.

* Eccles, p.107. Facsimile of records connected to the case in SS DL, p.183. The case ran until 7th June 1609.

c.September 1608 — Thomas Greene moves in with the Shakespeare family in New Place.

* Cf. 9th September 1609.

9th September 1608 — Mary Shakespeare, mother of the poet, is buried.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register in SS DL, p.181. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.7.

23rd September 1608 — Michael Hart, son of William Hart and Shakespeare's sister Joan, is baptised.

* EKC F&P2, p.7.

16th October 1608 — A William Walker, probably the one described as Shakespeare's godson, is baptised.

* Eccles, p.143. Eccles does not say where William Walker is described as Shakespeare's godson; the reference is in Shakespeare's will.

§ According to Halliwell-Phillipps, the event "is hardly of itself sufficient to prove he was then at Stratford, for the office was one that was frequently performed by proxy."[1] Presumably this is not also the case for the suit against John Addenbrooke in December of the same year, however, so there is at least some plausible contiguity between the Stratford events. Shakespeare may have been in Stratford following the death of his mother and the start of Thomas Greene's stay at New Place.

[1] Halliwell, James Orchard (1848). The Life of William Shakespeare. p.223.

13th November 1608 — Zorzi Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador, had by this date seen a performance of *Pericles* in London.

* Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.37. Cf. 1607, the writing of *Pericles*; Giustinian most likely saw the play during either the 1607 or 1608 summer theatre openings, unless he saw a private performance.

17th December 1608 — The Stratford Court of Record issues a precept signed by Thomas Greene, who was staying with the Shakespeare family at New Place, to arrest John Addenbrooke for a debt he owed to Shakespeare.

* Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.23. Addenbrooke is ordered to be arrested again in connection with this case on 15th March 1609. Greene had been staying at New Place since c.September 1608 (q.v.), cf. 9th September 1609.

21st December 1608 — A jury is formed for the Shakespeare vs. Addenbrooke case.

* SS R&I, p.60.

1609

1609 — John Davies of Hereford refers to Shakespeare and Richard Burbage in an marginal note.

* Davies, John (1609). Humours Heau'n on Earth with the Ciuile Warres of Death and Fortune. EEBO, STC 6332. p.208. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.204.

c.1609 — *Cymbeline* is written.

§ The clearest dating evidence for *Cymbeline* comes from its relationship with the Beaumont and Fletcher play *Philaster*, also known as *Love Lies a-Bleeding*.[1] There are three points of verbal resemblance. One is in the name of the character Bellario from *Philaster* with Belarius from *Cymbeline*. Another is in the word play around the words strange and stranger, from *Philaster* Act 1.1 77–9 and *Cymbeline* Act 2.1 31–9. The third, and closest, is a very strong resemblance between speeches concerning what Iachimo calls a drudge, *Cymbeline* Act 5.2 2–6, and Philaster calls a boor, Act 4.5 103–4. As well as the verbal resemblances, there is a connection in their both using the relatively new style of tragicomedy.[2]

Given that there are these, admittedly slight yet uncontentious, resemblances between the two plays, two further questions emerge. To date *Cymbeline* requires determining which of the plays was written first, and when *Philaster* was composed. Ros King pointed out in 2005 that *Philaster* "also contains extensive verbal echoes of *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *Twelfth Night*", making it more likely that Beaumont and Fletcher also borrowed from Shakespeare in the case of *Cymbeline*.[3] But there is disagreement about this. Robert Ornstein had argued over a decade before, for example, that "*Cymbeline* stands apart from the comedies that preceded it and the late romances that followed it precisely because of its Fletcherian mannerisms."[4] It may, however, be possible to make a case for an order based on collating all of the date constraints for the two plays.

[1] Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1185 also point to internal evidence that Shakespeare "may have had in mind the audiences and the stage equipment of the Blackfriars theatre, which his company used

from the autumn of 1609". [2] All from Beaumont, Francis and Fletcher, John (2004). Philaster, or Love Lies a-Bleeding. Gurr, Andrew (ed.). pp.xlv–xlvi. [3] King, Ros (2005). Cymbeline: Constructions of Britain. pp.37–8. [4] Ornstein, Robert (1994). Shakespeare's Comedies. p.258, fn.4.

§ The link between *Cymbeline* and *Philaster* is the most important evidence for dating the play, but it is not the only evidence. J. M. Nosworthy made the intriguing observation that the story of how two young men and an old man preserved the Britons from the Romans is not from Holinshed's descriptions of early Britain, but from his description of the history of Scotland, from the reign of King Kenneth.[1] Nosworthy argues that Shakespeare's first detailed use of Scottish material was for *Macbeth*, and notes but does not seem very convinced by the idea that Shakespeare may have come across the *Cymbeline* material when researching *King Lear*.

At any rate, Nosworthy's observation may be reinforced by the fact that *Cymbeline* bears a relation in provenance to *All's Well That Ends Well*, in that one of its major plot elements is taken from Boccaccio. With the exception of the Parolles subplot (which Charles I especially enjoyed), *All's Well* is derived entirely from tale 3.9 in Boccaccio's *Decameron*, possibly through the *Palace of Pleasure* (1595) by William Painter.[2] Shakespeare's adherence to the Boccaccio plot is exceptionally close, a fact which is not adequately reflected in 20th century psychological criticism of *All's Well*. The Iachimo plot from *Cymbeline*, the undercurrent of the play, is also derived from Boccaccio's *Decameron*, from story 2.9.[3] Shakespeare may have obtained this plot through a 16th century pamphlet called *Frederyke of Jennen*, which diverges from Boccaccio's plot in places where it agrees with Shakespeare.[4] The *Decameron* went through many French translations in the 16th century too,[5] but it does seem more likely that Shakespeare knew his two most obvious derivations of Boccaccio through indirect sources.

Whether or not Shakespeare knew, or cared, that both plots were from Boccaccio is another matter. But the similarity of the plots is also intriguing. In *All's Well*, Helena is shunned by her husband, and through artifice, a secret meeting, a ring, and shame, manages ostensibly to win him back. In *Cymbeline*, Innogen too is shunned by her husband—this time as a result of the artifice of Iachimo, from his secret installation—and only wins him back through the device of a ring and shame. The

similarity between the plots presumably did not go unnoticed by Shakespeare, and he is unlikely to have been ignorant of their common source. The main creative advance between the two plays is the complex development of Innogen's character, compared to the constant determination of Helena.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2002a). Cymbeline. Nosworthy, J. M. (ed.), Cengage. p.xv. [2] Shakespeare, William (2003b). All's Well That Ends Well. Fraser, Russell (ed.), Cambridge. p.1. [3] Anders, Henry R. D. (1904). Shakespeare's Books. p.60. [4] Shakespeare, William (2002a). Cymbeline. Nosworthy, J. M. (ed.), Cengage. p.xxii. [5] Anders, Henry R. D. (1904). Shakespeare's Books. p.60.

§ The possible source relationships between *Cymbeline* and the earlier Jacobean plays *All's Well That Ends Well*, *King Lear*, and *Macbeth*, may point to the original conception of *Cymbeline* dating amongst those plays. This argument, excluding the *All's Well* association, was apparently first advanced by Fleay in 1886.[1] He reinforced his argument with the observation that the character of Cloten appears to change throughout the play, perhaps suggesting that he was made more foolish as the writing process went on, and even that the play was written in two separate phases as a result. There is no more than very circumstantial evidence for this, but it is an attractive scenario. The idea would be that Shakespeare started by writing a sequel to *All's Well*, but abandoned it perhaps because he could not develop the character of Innogen in a satisfactory way, yet wanted all the same to distinguish her from Helena in this regard. After writing *Pericles*, however, with its romantic elements, ideas may have formed for a successful completion of *Cymbeline* in the romantic manner, building on earlier material derived from Boccaccio and British history.

[1] Shakespeare, William (1913). The Tragedie of Cymbeline. Furness, Horace Howard (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 18. p.450, who quotes Fleay.

§ *Cymbeline* is generally believed to have been written after *Pericles* and before *The Winter's Tale*, on the basis of the development of Shakespeare's romantic style.[1] *Pericles* can be dated quite reliably to 1607 (q.v.). Simon Forman saw *The Winter's Tale* performed at the Globe on 15th May 1611 (q.v.), and he had already seen *Cymbeline* performed there after 30th April 1611. Therefore both *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale* were on stage by mid-1611. This evidence along with the stylistic argument alone places *Cymbeline* in the period between 1607 and some time before mid-1611. *The Winter's Tale* would

require some time to be written and staged, and Shakespeare was working on *The Tempest* in late 1610 into 1611, which places *The Winter's Tale* back in early to mid 1610. *Coriolanus* was written in 1608, and early to mid 1609 saw the publication of editions of *Troilus and Cressida* and Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, publishing processes that the author may have been involved with in some capacity. Though this leaves a plausible gap in late 1607, or one in late 1608, this places *Cymbeline* most comfortably in the period from mid 1609 to early 1610.

Philaster was was written for the King's Men. Beaumont and Fletcher had most reason to change companies to the King's Men in 1608, when the Children of Blackfriars for whom they had been writing ran into difficulty and lost their theatre. Moreover, James E. Savage showed that *Philaster* probably came after *Cupid's Revenge*, which was written from late 1607 to early 1608. The latest that *Philaster* could have been written is mid 1610, as John Davies of Hereford, who was a friend of Fletcher and also knew Beaumont, wrote an epigram mentioning the play in his *Scourge of Folly*, entered in the Stationers' Register on 8th October 1610.[2] Therefore *Philaster* must have been written between mid 1608 and mid 1610.

It may be possible to date *Philaster* even more precisely. There is an unusual reference in the play to the Prince going to see the city and the "new platform", a feature which is not mentioned again in the play. The "new platform" may therefore be a topical reference, and there is one event which particularly stands out as being the potential referent here. Andrew Gurr (2004) says that the platform was the model of the deck for the great new ship built for Prince Henry, the *Prince Royal*. King James visited the construction effort on 8th May 1609, and ordered a matter to be tried, according to Phineas Pette the shipbuilder, on "the great platform, which was purposely framed of planks to the full scale of the ship."[3] Ros King (2005) argued subsequently, however, that though this is true, the public throng going to see the ship did not materialise, again according to Phineas Pette, until Easter to Michaelmas 1610, the ship then being launched on 24th September.[4] Gurr, then, had argued that mid 1609 was the point of greatest topicality, whereas King refuted this arguing mid 1610 as the point of greatest topicality instead. King argued that the platform was more likely to mean the "orlop" or lower deck of the ship. Suzanne Gossett (2007) on the other hand argues

that the platform was "clearly new in 1609; a year later a topical reference might have taken a different form."[5] She believes that Ros King is unconvincing and that Gurr has the better argument. Most notably she points out that the OED does not have a reference for platform meaning orlop until sixty years after the construction. It is far more reasonable to assume a reference to what was described by the master shipbuilder himself as a "great platform" than the orlop. Therefore this was most reasonably a topical reference in mid 1609.

[1] Muir and Barroll both thought this, for example, and both are summarised in McMullan, Gordon (2007). Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing. p.81. [2] Arber 3, p.201b / 446. The rest of the information here pertaining to *Philaster* is from Beaumont, Francis and Fletcher, John (2004). Philaster, or Love Lies a-Bleeding. Gurr, Andrew (ed.). pp.xxvi–xxvii. [3] Beaumont, Francis and Fletcher, John (2004). Philaster, or Love Lies a-Bleeding. Gurr, Andrew (ed.). p.xxvii. [4] King, Ros (2005). Cymbeline: Constructions of Britain. pp.40–1. [5] Gossett, Suzanne (2007). Taking Pericles Seriously. In: Lyne, Raphael and Mukherji, Subha (eds.). Early Modern Tragicomedy. p.108, fn.23.

§ The most plausible date for *Philaster* is mid 1609, which perhaps not coincidentally is also the most plausible date for *Cymbeline*. The theatres were closed from 28th July 1608 due to plague, and did not reopen again until December 1609. The King's Men were touring East Anglia in May 1609, but would have made court performances too that year; they performed 12 plays at court in the 1608–9 Christmas season when the theatres were closed, and 13 plays in the 1609–10 Christmas season when they were again open.[1] Which of the two plays was written first is an open question, but it is reasonable to date *Philaster* to 1609, and quite reasonable to date *Cymbeline* to the same year. If the theory of revision, that *Cymbeline* is an elaboration of an earlier plot or even a nascent and temporarily abandoned play, is correct, then it may bear some relation to the peculiar edition of *Troilus and Cressida* which was published in early 1609, and perhaps even the *Sonnets*. It may also be apposite that *Pericles* was written by Shakespeare to complete the work of George Wilkins. Perhaps for his next experiment in the romantic form he decided to complete one of his own earlier plays, finding that the romantic idiom gave him a new expressive avenue through it could be completed.

[1] EKC ES 4, pp.174–5.

c.1609 — Francis Beaumont possibly writes about Shakespeare's best lines as being clear from all learning.

§ The reference comes in a verse letter found in 1921 transcribed into an old commonplace book and signed "F.B.". The letter is not dated, and Brooke says the verses plausibly belong to the period 1608–1610, grouping them with other epistles of similar style that Beaumont wrote to Jonson.[1] The *Dictionary of Literary Biography* dates it,[2] without any given rationale, to 1615, possibly because this is the year before Beaumont's death.

The lines which pertain to Shakespeare are:[3]

For if this equall but the stile, which men
send Cheese to towne with, and thankes downe agen,
tis all I seeke for: heere I would let slippe
(If I had any in mee) schollershippe,
and from all Learninge keepe these lines as deere [adm. cleere]
as Shakespeares best are, which our heires shall heare

[1] Details from Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. p.64. [2] DLB 263, pp.236–239. [3] DLB 263, pp.236–239.

§ The lines show that Beaumont was already thinking of Shakespeare as a poet of lasting popularity, and that he could be free in expressing this sentiment to Jonson. It also shows an early example of the trope that Shakespeare was a natural poet, at least when he was at his best, when he was unencumbered by what Beaumont calls "learning". If these lines do date to around c.1609, it is interesting to note that John Davies of Hereford addressed his epigram "To our English Terence Mr. William Shake-speare" in the *Scourge of Folly*, which was entered in the Stationers' Register on 8th October 1610.[1] Terence, though considered a "comical poet, pithy, pleasant, and very profitable", was also considered in style "closer to everyday speech" and "congenial to youth".[2] Beaumont also says that he himself has no scholarship in him, so that he categorises himself with Shakespeare in this respect. This means that unlike Jonson,

whose famous comment that Shakespeare lacked was a slight, Beaumont was presumably not denigrating Shakespeare with this characterisation.

[1] Q.v. 8th October 1610. [2] Grafton, Anthony, Most, Glenn W., and Settis, Salvatore (2010). The Classical Tradition. Terence. p.930. The first quote is from Richard Bernard (1598), and the other two quotes are from Erasmus (1511).

4th January 1609 — John Heminges receives a payment of £40 for private practice.

§ The payment was issued "by way of his majesties rewarde for their private practise in the time of infeccion that thereby they mighte be inhabled to performe their service before his Majestie in Christmas hollidaies 1609".[1]

[1] Gurr, Andrew (2004c). The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642. p.62.

28th January 1609 — *Troilus and Cressida* is again entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.178b / 400, and SS R&I, p.219.

15th February 1609 — The jurors in the Shakespeare vs. Addenbrooke case are called to appear at the next sitting of court.

* Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. p.58. Also in the DLB.

15th March 1609 — John Addenbrooke is once again to be arrested and produced at the next court sitting in the case of Shakespeare vs. Addenbrooke.

* Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. pp.58–9 gives the order. Also mentioned in Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.23.

9th May 1609 — The King's Men are paid 26s 8d for playing in Ipswich.

* EKC F&P2, p.335.

16th May 1609 — The King's Men are paid for a performance in Hythe.

* EKC F&P2, p.336.

17th May 1609 — The King's Men are paid for a performance in New Romney.

* EKC F&P2, p.336.

20th May 1609 — *Shakespeare's Sonnets* are entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.183b / 410, and SS R&I, p.219.

§ Sonnets had been in vogue since *Astrophil and Stella*, Sir Philip Sidney's sonnet sequence, was published in 1591. Shakespeare alluded to the sonnet vogue in both *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Romeo and Juliet*, but the vogue did not last beyond the 1590s. This, and the fact that two of the poems in *Shakespeare's Sonnets* had appeared in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, *variatim*, in 1599 strongly suggests that Shakespeare composed at least the initial versions of the majority of his sonnets in the 1590s.[1]

[1] All derived from Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.777.

7th June 1609 — In the case of Addenbrooke vs. Shakespeare, John Addenbrooke had skipped town, so his surety was ordered to pay Shakespeare.

* Eccles, p.107. The case had run since 17th August 1608 (q.v.).

19th June 1609 — Edward Alleyn records a purchase of *Shakespeare's Sonnets*.

* Duncan-Jones, Katherine (2010). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Sonnets. p.7, who also notes that she believes it is a Collier forgery. Edmondson, Paul and Wells, Stanley (2004). The Oxford Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Sonnets. p.5 give a facsimile, and state that they think the entry is authentic, though also noting that the authenticity of the entry is disputed: that some scholars attribute it to Collier. In their comprehensive study of Collier, however, Freeman, Arthur, and Freeman, Janet Ing (2004). John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century. Vol. 1. p.1142 state that the manuscript "seems perfectly genuine to us".

9th September 1609 — Thomas Greene is staying at New Place.

§ Greene was living at New Place, and had apparently been doing so for at least a year. He wanted at this time to move to a house then owned by George Browne. Greene was hoping to be in possession of this house by 25th March 1610, and to have it

repaired to his satisfaction by 29th September 1610. Browne had, however, subsequently started to change his mind about the deal. Greene therefore wrote a list of reasons indicating why he thought that Browne had intended to proceed with the deal.[1] It is in this manuscript, dated 9th September 1609, that Greene writes, referring to Browne: "he doubted whether he might sowe his garden, untill about my going to the Terme (seing I could gett no carryage to help me here with tymber) I was content to permytt yt without contradicion. & the rather because I perceyved I might stay another yere at new place." Greene was definitely in possession of the house he wanted on 21st June 1611 since the house is mentioned as his in corporation records. Eccles found that when Greene offered the house for sale in May 1617, he said that he paid £400 for it within the last six years, indicating that he had purchased the house in 1611.[2]

[1] From a review, Adlard, J. E. (1866). Review of An Historical Account of the New Place. The British Controversialist and Literary Magazine. Vol. 8. p.146 of Halliwell, James Orchard (1864). An Historical Account of the New Place. p.146, of which it seems only thirty copies were privately printed. [2] All derived from Eccles, pp.131–2, except for the exact date of the corporation record, which is from Adlard, J. E. (1866). Review of An Historical Account of the New Place. The British Controversialist and Literary Magazine. Vol. 8. p.146.

§ Greene says that he perceived he may be able to "stay another yere at new place", which implies that he had already stayed there for about a year. If taken quite literally, this would put the initial date of his lodging at around September 1608. Perhaps it is more than coincidence that Shakespeare's mother had been buried exactly one year before Greene's list of reasons? If Greene had been staying at the home for about a year, he was either staying there just before Mary Shakespeare died, or arrived there just afterwards. Perhaps, if the former case is so, Mary Shakespeare was unwell and in need of some extra care, and Greene may have helped; but, if the latter is so, it may be that Greene came in to fill a missing place in the household. This lends more suggestion to the notion that Shakespeare was in Stratford at the end of 1608. As well as his mother's death, he may have been present for the baptism of William Walker, described as his godson, on 16th October 1608. The theatres had closed due to plague on 28th July 1608, so perhaps Shakespeare had already made the journey back home. That a new lodger should then be allowed to stay in New Place from around September 1608 may mean that Shakespeare was involved directly in giving

permission for this to go ahead. Though such permission could have been sought and given by correspondence, the event may nonetheless suggest Shakespeare's presence in Stratford in late 1608.

21st November 1609 — Gilbert Shakespeare, William's brother, is involved in a lawsuit with Peter Roswell, Richard Mytton, Mary Burnell, and others in Stratford.

* Eccles, pp.108–109.

December 1609 — The theatres reopen, having been closed due to plague since 28th July 1608.

* George, David (2000). Plutarch, Insurrection, and Dearth. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 53. p.71 gives the plague death count as falling below 30 from 7th December 1609, which would mean that the theatres could be reopened. Cites Leeds Barroll, J. (1991). Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater. pp.225–6 and p.242.

1610

c.1610 — *The Winter's Tale* is written.

§ *The Winter's Tale* was probably written in 1610. On stylistic grounds it is widely seen as coming after *Cymbeline* and before *The Tempest*.[1] Simon Forman saw it performed at the Globe on 15th May 1611,[2] and the play contains, more indeterminately, a parallel with *Oberon*, a masque by Ben Jonson the first performance of which was at court on 1st January 1611.[3]

The relationships with *The Tempest* and *Oberon* have drawn the most attention. Analysis of *The Tempest* shows that it must have been written after around 1st September 1610, when the news of the event that inspired the main theme reached England, and before 1st November 1611, when *The Tempest* was performed.[4] Since the news would have been most topical immediately after the former of these dates, and since there were indeed numerous ballads and other pieces circulating about it, it makes most sense that *The Tempest* was written not long after. Edmond Malone recorded that *The Tempest* "was performed before the middle of 1611", which is mysterious in its accompanying reference, referring to a work which does not exist, and uncorroborated.[5]

[1] Hall, Joan Lord (2005). The Winter's Tale: a Guide to the Play. p.12 says, for example, that "most scholars agree that it was written after both *Pericles* (1608–09) and *Cymbeline* (1609–10). Certainly it was produced before Shakespeare's final romance, *The Tempest* (1611)." McMullan, Gordon (2007). Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing. p.81 gives other examples; both mention Oxford as a notable exception, but they place *Cymbeline* after *The Winter's Tale*, very much against the general consensus. [2] Q.v. 15th May 1611, and EKC F&P2, pp.340–1. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1123 consider this the only solid external dating evidence. [3] Sokol, B. J. (1994). Art and Illusion in The Winter's Tale. p.88 citing Hosley, Richard (1980). Oberon, the Fairy Prince, by Ben Jonson. Wells, Stanley, Spencer, T. J. B., and Nicoll, Allardyce (eds.). p.45. [4] Q.v. 1st November 1611, and EKC F&P2, p.342. [5] Boswell Jr., James (1821). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Vol. 15. p.414, "See the Essay on the Chronological Order of Shakespeare's plays, vol. i." There is no such essay in that volume, and the existing essays on the same matter do not contain any evidence to corroborate the claim.

§ Understanding the parallel between *Oberon* and *The Winter's Tale* in turn structures the logic for the most likely date of *The Tempest*. If *The Winter's Tale* precedes *Oberon*, then *The Tempest* could have been written during the winter of 1610/11. For this to be so, either Jonson alludes to Shakespeare, or the allusion to Jonson was interpolated into *The Winter's Tale* after completion. If *Oberon* precedes *The Winter's Tale*, then since a court masque for a specific event is unlikely to have been augmented later on, Shakespeare simply alludes to Jonson.

The text of the parallel makes it more likely that Shakespeare alludes to Jonson than vice versa. *Oberon* was performed for Prince Henry's coming of age celebrations, Henry himself would have acted Oberon, and there is reason to believe that King James was present at the performance.[1] The allusion in *The Winter's Tale* is to a specific dance sequence involving satyrs:

"In *Oberon* the action began with ten satyrs howling and calling out as the moon rose over a dark rock. They sang and chattered until the rock split open to reveal a palace with transparent walls and battlements. Suddenly the satyrs began '*an antique dance, full of gesture, and swift motion, and continued it, till the crowing of the cock*' (Jonson, 7.351)"[2]

This corresponds to a sequence from *The Winter's Tale*, Act 4.4. The Shepherd's son says that they will have a song from Autolycus, but away from his father because he and the gentlemen, the disguised Polixenes and Camillo, are "in sad talke". Autolycus gives them the song. Then a servant comes in saying that "three Carters, three Shepherds, three Neat-herds, three Swine-herds y [sic] haue made themselues all men of haire" are wanting to perform a dance. The Shepherd does not allow this, but Polixenes allows the twelve to perform. The servant then says that "One three of them, by their owne report (Sir,) hath danc'd before the King: and not the worst of the three, but iumpes twelue foote and a halfe by th' squire." After the dance, "of twelue Satyres", Polixenes jumps straight back into the conversation with the Shepherd.[3]

The reference to three that have "danc'd before the King" may allude to three of the King's Men that danced before James in the performance of *Oberon*.[4] But the fact that

this episode comes after an interlude itself, the song by Autolycus, makes it suspect. The text still makes logical sense without the performance, going straight from the song of Autolycus to the serious discussion between Polixenes and the Shepherd. Why would a servant break up their discussion, saying that a dozen people want to perform a dance, when his son did not previously do so for the song by Autolycus? Perhaps this inconsistency relates to the fact that the whole segment was added afterwards. There has been a suggestion that the segment was designed to be abandoned after initial performance,[5] but if so then it was awkwardly done. Awkwardness is more likely a sign of patching.

In this case, the most likely scenario is that when *The Winter's Tale* was in early performance, the topical allusion to Jonson's perhaps quite popular satyrs was added. This means that *The Tempest* may have been written in the winter of 1610 to 1611, instead of *The Winter's Tale*, with the reasonable assumption that the two were not composed simultaneously.[6] Perhaps *The Tempest* came hard on the heels of *The Winter's Tale*: a "Winter's Tale" would be a more apposite title if it was first produced in winter. Yet Simon Forman saw it in the summer, in 1611. On balance a 1610 date for *The Winter's Tale* is most reasonable.

[1] Parry, Graham (1981). The Golden Age Restor'd: the Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42. p.74 gives evidence of Henry playing Oberon, and James being present on "Arthur's Chair" when Oberon comes back from fairyland. See also, for example, Goldberg, Jonathan (1989). James the First and the Politics of Literature. p.123. [2] Shakespeare, William (2010b). The Winter's Tale. Pitcher, John (ed.), Arden. p.394. [3] Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. Comedies, pp.293–4. [4] Duncan-Jones, Katherine (2001). Ungentle Shakespeare. p.229 states—without justification, and without mentioning the more likely King allusion—that it is "just possible" that Jonson borrows from Shakespeare. [5] Shakespeare, William (2010b). The Winter's Tale. Pitcher, John (ed.), Arden. p.92–3, who argues for this in detail, answered in Shakespeare, William (2011d). The Winter's Tale. Rhu, Lawrence F. (ed.), Evans Shakespeare. p.186. Rhu's point about Polixenes' reply is the origin of the comment on that in the present work. [6] Cf. c.1607, the writing of *Pericles* for a survey of the frequency of the writing of Shakespeare's plays. Shakespeare wrote on average 1.2 plays per year after *Hamlet*. There is no evidence that Shakespeare composed any plays simultaneously based on the dates estimated for them in the present work: he seems, indeed, to have stopped work on 2 *Henry IV* to write the *Merry Wives of Windsor*; and *Julius Caesar*, for example, follows directly from *Henry V*. His additions to *1st Henry VI* may have been composed simultaneously with *Richard III*, but *1st Henry VI* does not seem to have been a major project for Shakespeare.

c.1610 — Shakespeare's Sonnet 8 is copied in an early manuscript copy, attributed to Shakespeare by name.

* EKC Allusions, p.211, which gives c.1610 as a highly conjectural date based on the poem being copied in a "hand of the earlier part of James I's reign".

2nd February 1610 — *Pericles* is performed by a troupe of country players at Gowthwaite Hall in Yorkshire.

* Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case. p.38. Not in EKC F&P2, p.336 despite containing the Keeling records, but cf. Shakespeare, William (2008m). Pericles. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford. p.4.

8th February 1610 — Robert Keysar enters a bill in the suit of Keysar vs. Burbage and others concerning the Blackfriars.

* EKC F&P2, pp.64–5.

12th February 1610 — Burbage et al. make an answer in the case of Keysar vs. Burbage and others.

* EKC F&P2, p.65.

5th March 1610 — Gilbert Shakespeare, William's brother, signs a lease in Stratford.

* Brooke, Tucker (1926). Shakespeare of Stratford. p.42.

30th April 1610 — Prince Lewis Frederick of Württemberg sees "l'histoire du More de Venise", *Othello*, at the Globe.

* EKC F&P2, p.336.

c.July 1610 — The King's Men went to play in the provinces, including performances at Dover, Oxford, Shrewsbury, Stafford, and Sudbury.

* EKC F&P2, p.336.

c.1st September 1610 — Sir Thomas Gates arrives back in England, in an incident which was the impetus for writing *The Tempest*.

* Vaughan, Alden T. (2008). William Strachey's True Reportory and Shakespeare: A Closer Look at the Evidence. Shakespeare Quarterly, 59.3. p.270, fn.66.

24th September 1610 — Henry Jackson writes a letter mentioning his having seen a performance of *Othello* by the King's Men at Oxford.

* Tillotson, Geoffrey (1933). Othello and The Alchemist at Oxford in 1610. Times Literary Supplement, 20th July 1933. p.494, and Roach, Joseph R. (1985). The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting. p.228.

§ Jackson writes, originally in Latin but here translated into English, "They also had tragedies, which they acted with propriety and fitness. In which [tragedies], not only through speaking but also through acting certain things, they moved [the audience] to tears. But truly the celebrated Desdemona, slain in our presence by her husband, although she pleaded her case very effectively throughout, yet moved [us] more after she was dead, when, lying on her bed, she entreated the pity of the spectators by her very countenance."[1]

[1] Yachnin, Paul (2006). Wonder-Effects: Othello's Handkerchief. In: Harris, Jonathan Gil and Korda, Natasha (eds.). Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama. p.328.

24th September 1610 — The Blackfriars brewer Elias James is buried, and Shakespeare may have written his epitaph.

* Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems. p.450.

1st October 1610 — Sir William Browne writes to William Trumbull that all this week the King's Men had been performing at Sheppey.

§ Sir William writes, "The Lord of Mongomery made a feast att his howse in sheppey where all manner of sportes were provyded, haunting, hunting, fishing, dauncing, the kings players with comedyes and tragedies .2. every day this feast lasted .4. dayes: The

king was att wansted butt on Tuesday last came to wollich where he saw the greatest and fayrest ship launched yat ever was made in England"[1]

[1] Gibson, James M. (2002). Kent: Diocese of Canterbury. Records of Early English Drama. Vol. 2, Records. pp.926–7.

8th October 1610 — *The Scourge of Folly* by John Davies of Hereford, which may allude to tension between Shakespeare and Jonson, and in which Epigram 159 is addressed to Shakespeare, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.201b / 446. On the tension between Shakespeare and Jonson, Bednarz, James P. (2001). Shakespeare and the Poets' War. pp.43–4.

19th October 1610 — The King's Men play in Dunwich between this day and 26th October.

* Knutson, Roslyn L. (2002). Two Playhouses, Both Alike in Dignity. Shakespeare Studies, 30. p.112.

1611

1611 — *The Tempest* is completed and performed.

§ *The Tempest* is based on the topical news circulating after September 1610 about the shipwreck of the *Sea Venture* near Bermuda.[1] The play is most particularly indebted in terms of source to William Strachey's letter, the *True Repertory of the Wrack and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates*, dated 15th July 1610 in Virginia.[2] Strachey's letter was carried back to England on board one of the vessels belonging to Sir Thomas Gates, either the *Blessing* or the *Hercules* or perhaps one of his lesser ships,[3] which arrived in London around 1st September 1610.[4]

The *True Repertory* was first published in 1625 by Purchas,[5] who obtained his copy from Hakluyt.[6] Before then it was passed around only in manuscript,[7] so Shakespeare must have had access to it socially. Since the plot is so strongly entwined with this news, no substantial part of the play could have been written before September 1610. The first solid evidence of the play's existence is a 1st November 1611 performance. Quite probably the play was written and staged as quickly as possible to capitalise on the popularity of the news of the event. Shakespeare wasn't the only one to capitalise on it: eight or more accounts, which came to be known as the "Bermuda pamphlets" were written about it,[8] the first of which was registered on the 1st October 1610 by Richard Rich.[9]

[1] Shakespeare, William (1968b). The Tempest. Righter, Anne (ed.), Penguin. p.23, and Vaughan, Alden T. and Vaughan, Virginia Mason (1999). Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History. p.39. [2] Wells, Stanley, and Taylor, Gary (1997). William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion. p.132. Cf. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1221. [3] Vaughan, Alden T. (2008). William Strachey's True Reportory and Shakespeare: A Closer Look at the Evidence. Shakespeare Quarterly, 59.3. p.263, fn.45. [4] Vaughan, Alden T. (2008). William Strachey's True Reportory and Shakespeare: A Closer Look at the Evidence. Shakespeare Quarterly, 59.3. p.270, fn.66. [5] Purchas, Samuel (1625). Purchas His Pilgrimes. EEBO, STC 20509. Vol. 3, Chapter VI. p.1734. [6] Vaughan, Alden T. (2008). William Strachey's True Reportory and Shakespeare: A Closer Look at the Evidence. Shakespeare Quarterly, 59.3. p.246–7. [7] Vaughan, Alden T. (2008). William Strachey's True Reportory and Shakespeare: A Closer Look at the Evidence. Shakespeare Quarterly, 59.3. p.245. [8] Vaughan, Alden T. (2008). William Strachey's True

Reportory and Shakespeare: A Closer Look at the Evidence. Shakespeare Quarterly, 59.3. p.270. [9] EKC F&P1, p.491.

§ A peculiar sentence in the Third Variorum edition of Shakespeare's Plays (1821) states the following about *The Tempest*: "That it was performed before the middle of 1611, we have already seen†." The dagger footnoted to "See the Essay on the Chronological Order of Shakespeare's plays, Vol.i.".[1] The 1821 Variorum was published after Malone's death, edited by his friend James Boswell Jr., the son of the famous biographer. Boswell Jr. had access to Malone's literary remains. The work does contain an *Essay on the Chronological Order of Shakespeare's Plays*,[2] but this is situated in Volume II, not Volume I. This would seem to be a trifling error, a case of a missing "i", but the situation is much more complicated than it would at first appear.

The *Chronological Order* essay by Malone was first published in the 1778 *Variorum* under its original title, *An Attempt to Ascertain the Order in which the Plays of Shakespeare were Written*. Malone then revised the essay and published it again under the same title in the 1790 *Works*, in his own edition of the plays of Shakespeare. The essay as it appears in the 1821 *Variorum* had been revised once again,[3] so that there are three different versions of Malone's essay to which the *Tempest* footnote may refer.

Malone's conclusions about *The Tempest* had changed throughout the process of this revision. In the 1778 essay, he dated *The Tempest* to 1612, but by the 1821 version, it was being dated inconsistently to both 1611 and 1612. The reason for this subsequent inconsistency is clumsy editing by Malone to include the findings of a pamphlet that he had written in 1808 regarding the sources and date of *The Tempest*,[4] which he called an "Account".[5] This *Account* was even included in the 1821 *Variorum*, in Volume XV. It is this *Account*, indeed, in which Malone's peculiar note about the performance date of *The Tempest* appears.

The peculiar characteristic of Malone's note is that scholars have been so far unable to find the evidence to which it refers. E.K. Chambers, for example, characterises it as a "promise to show" some evidence about the date, a promise which he says was "never carried out".[6] More recently, Wells and Taylor characterise it not as a promise

but as an unfulfilled "claim" regarding the date, whose basis has "never been discovered".[7] All three of Chambers, and Wells and Taylor cite the same page in Volume XV of the 1821 *Variorum*, which was a reprint of the 1808 pamphlet. It is surprising that they do not both cite the 1808 pamphlet itself, which was the original publication of the note; perhaps they did not know about it. In fact, the note itself, starting "That it was performed before the middle", is a verbatim reprint in the 1821 *Variorum* from the 1808 pamphlet.

One characteristic about the note which had changed between the 1808 and 1821 versions: the footnote was updated. In the 1808 version it had been more vague, and says simply: "Under a former article."[8] Malone died in 1812, so this raises the possibility that the new footnote in the 1821 *Variorum* was written by Boswell Jr. The fact that the 1821 footnote refers to the chronology essay in "vol. i", however, is suspicious, because the essay had indeed been in Volume I in the 1778 *Variorum*. This makes it more likely that Malone updated the footnote himself before 1812, at which point the most recent variorum had included his essay in its Volume I, which would make the footnote syntactically consistent. If Boswell Jr. had added the footnote, presumably he would have made it consistent with the rest of the 1821 *Variorum* instead.

Chambers on the other hand, as we have seen, regarded the note in the 1821 *Variorum* as a promise to show the work. This makes sense if Chambers did not know about the 1808 pamphlet. The situation was probably that Chambers saw the 1821 footnote and tried to find what it referred to. He was unable to find it in any edition of the essay on chronology by Malone that he had to hand, and therefore regarded it as a future work which Boswell Jr. was perhaps supposed to publish from Malone's literary remains. This makes sense only if Chambers did not know about the 1808 pamphlet, because there the footnote clearly refers to a former article which Malone had already published. Whatever the scenario to account for this, it means that Chambers was wrong to characterise it in this way. Malone had considered in 1808 that his information about the performance date of *The Tempest* was already available. It is true that the 1808 pamphlet was printed in 80 copies only,[9] and was passed to various friends and acquaintances with strict orders personally inscribed by Malone in each

copy not to let any part of it be published.[10] With this audience in mind, perhaps the "former article" was one which was likewise privately published but which has not come to light.

Another argument against Chambers's interpretation is that the 1821 *Variorum* edition of Malone's essay on chronology, in Volume II of that work, is itself updated to include findings from Malone's 1808 pamphlet on *The Tempest*. If Chambers thought that Malone was planning to revise the chronology essay even past its 1821 state, so as to include the evidence about the middle of 1611, then why did Malone not do so when he incorporated the evidence from 1808 into the essay?

Three changes were made to the chronology essay to bring it to its 1821 state. Two whole paragraphs were cut, and one was added. The first cut concerned the "Bermuda-Islands" source material which he investigated in much more detail in his 1808 pamphlet. It is not clear why he cut this paragraph, but the 1808 essay was issued privately because Malone was keeping it for his Magnum Opus, and the strict exhortation not to publish the information was not kept, due to what Malone calls external misinformation.[11] Perhaps, then, he was simply preparing an essay that would not conflict with the evidence that he was planning to publish in his Magnum Opus. Yet he was not so careful to remove a separate inconsistency regarding the marriage of the Earl of Essex and Lady Frances.

The second cut was of a paragraph summarising Malone's belief in a 1612 date for *The Tempest*. Malone replaced this paragraph with the following insertion: "Since this Essay was first published, I have collected information on this subject, which places it in my opinion beyond a doubt that this play was founded on a recent event, and was produced in 1611."[12] The "collected information" probably refers to the pamphlet of 1808. This change also had the effect of making the essay inconsistent in its general conclusion, because the whole section is still inappropriately titled "The Tempest, 1612". This title had probably been copied verbatim, because it mirrors the 1778 title of the essay.

This is not the only inconsistency in the essay which was, in effect, caused by the editing. There were also incorrect details left unrevised. The paragraph in question, unchanged from the 1778 edition, regards a conjecture by Holt that Act 5 of *The Tempest* was intended "as a compliment to the Earl of Essex, on his being united in wedlock, in 1611, to Lady Frances Howard".[13] Holt thought that the marriage had taken place in 1610, but Malone said in a footnote that Holt was mistaken and that 1611 was the correct date. The marriage of Essex and Lady Frances was a major court scandal of the Stuart period, and ended in an acrimonious divorce procedure. Malone had expanded the original point a little for his 1808 pamphlet, as by then he had realised that the marriage had actually been in 1606, not 1611. Furthermore, though Holt had said that the marriage was consummated in 1610, Malone had now found evidence of their cohabitation in 1609.[14] (There was later a court case about Lady Frances's virginity.)[15]

The original statement by Malone in the 1778 edition of the chronology essay, that the couple were "united in wedlock, in 1611", had therefore been found incorrect. Malone evidently took no pains to revise this part of the essay in the notes of whatever form Boswell Jr. used to create the 1821 edition of the piece. The revision that did take place is therefore clumsy in at least two respects. The only other change to the section is the addition of a relatively innocuous paragraph at the end about Ben Jonson.

Though Malone was wrong about the 1611 wedding, this is the only mention of the year 1611 in the whole essay as it originally appeared in the 1778 and 1790 versions. Could it therefore be the case that Malone considered this to be the basis of the evidence of a performance of *The Tempest* before mid 1611? Presumably this cannot be so, for two reasons. The first is that if he considered this to be the datum showing that *The Tempest* was earlier than 1612, he would not then have summarised the whole section in a title and a paragraph-sized summary saying that the play was most likely written in fact in 1612. The second is that the mention of the performance before mid 1611 first appears in Malone's 1808 pamphlet. It is this pamphlet, also, in which the corrected date for the Essex and Lady Frances marriage first appears. Malone

would presumably not in the same short work say that he had evidence the play was performed before mid 1611 while also saying that the evidence used is from 1606.

The situation as it stands is, therefore, a perfect conundrum. Malone considered that he had already published the evidence that *The Tempest* was performed before the middle of 1611, and this publication must have taken place by 1808. In 1790 he had still been saying that the play was most likely written in 1612. The footnote in the 1821 *Variorum*, either by Malone or by Boswell Jr., seems to refer to Volume I of the 1778 *Variorum*, which is at least consistent as a citation, but which makes no sense given that no evidence regarding *The Tempest* and the middle of 1611 is to be found therein.

[1] Malone, Edmond (1821). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Boswell Jr., James (ed.). Vol. 15. p.414. [2] Malone, Edmond (1821). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Boswell Jr., James (ed.). Vol. 2. p.464–7. [3] Cf. Martin, Peter (1995). Edmond Malone, Shakespearean Scholar: A Literary Biography. p.273. [4] That the editing was done by Malone is evident from the fact that one of the insertions is written by Malone in the first person. [5] Malone, Edmond (1808). An Account of the Incidents from which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest were Derived. [6] EKC F&P1, p.491. [7] Wells, Stanley, and Taylor, Gary (1997). William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion. p.132. [8] Malone, Edmond (1808). An Account of the Incidents from which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest were Derived. p.31. [9] Martin, Peter (1995). Edmond Malone, Shakespearean Scholar: A Literary Biography. p.260. [10] Malone, Edmond (1808). An Account of the Incidents from which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest were Derived. Author's inscription in each copy, e.g.: 'To / John Courtenay Esqre / from the Author. / — / Not published, eighty copies only / having been printed. / — / It is requested that this pamphlet / may not be inadvertently put into / the hands of any person who might / be likely to publish any part of it.' [11] Malone, Edmond (1808). An Account of the Incidents from which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest were Derived. p.37. This is in material of 1809 which was appended to the tract, even though it is dated 1808. [12] Malone, Edmond (1821). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Boswell Jr., James (ed.). Vol. 2. p.465. [13] Malone, Edmond (1821). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Boswell Jr., James (ed.).. Vol. 2. p.466. [14] Malone, Edmond (1808). An Account of the Incidents from which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest were Derived. p.35. [15] Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008b). Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works. p.1027.

1611 — *The Troublesome Raigne*, which influenced Shakespeare's *King John*, is attributed to "W. Sh." on the title page of a new edition printed by Valentine Simmes for John Helme.

* Sh., W. [Anon] (1611). The first and second part of the troublesome raigne of Iohn King of England. EEBO, STC 14646. Title Page. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.226.

1611 — William Drummond of Hawthornden records having in his possession the books attributed to Shakespeare that he read in 1606.

* EKC Allusions, p.164. The only book whose purchase price is noted is that of *Romeo and Juliet*, 4d.

c.1611 — Shakespeare's Coat of Arms is recorded in official documents.

§ The document was prepared by Nicholas Charles, as noticed by Hunter, and the arms have "William Shakspere" written over them. There is a trick, the heraldic term for a sketch, of Michael Drayton's arms on the same page.[1] The heralds may therefore have known that the arms had by now descended to John's son. Nicholas Charles was Lancaster Herald, having been created so on 19th November 1608,[2] a post which he held until his death on 19th November 1613.

[1] Hunter, Joseph (1845). New Illustrations of the Life, Studies, and Writings of Shakespeare. p.23. Cites "Harl. MS. 6140. f. 45 b." [2] Simpson, Robert (1852). The History and Antuiquities of the Town of Lancaster. p.370.

10th February 1611 — John Witter gives his share of the Globe to Heminges.

* Wallace, Charles William (1910). Shakespeare and his London Associates. University Studies of the University of Nebraska, Vol. 10. p.318, and Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield (1927). The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. pp.99–100. The date is the February in the "Eight yeere of his Ma^{tes} said raigne", which was from 24th March 1610 to 24th March 1611.

13th February 1611 — A reply by William Combe to a Bill of Complaint by Richard Lane concerning the tithes that Shakespeare bought from Sir Ralph Hubaud in 1605 is sworn to in Chancery.

* EKC F&P2, pp.124–5.

20th April 1611 — Simon Forman sees *Macbeth* on this day, and *Cymbeline* under ten days later, at the Globe.

* EKC F&P2, pp.337–9. Facsimile of the Cymbeline account in SS DL, p.215.

30th April 1611 — Simon Forman sees an otherwise unknown play about *Richard II* at the Globe.

* EKC F&P2, pp.339–40.

15th May 1611 — Simon Forman sees *The Winter's Tale* at the Globe.

* EKC F&P2, pp.340–1.

28th May 1611 — Shakespeare's holdings of 107 acres of land, plus an extra 20 acres of pasture, are legally confirmed.

* HP O2, p.25 and EKC F&P2, p.109 only give the year. According to Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). The Shakespeare Documents. Vol. 2. p.412, the legal confirmation took place on 28th May 1611. HP O2, p.331 gave the date as 28th May 1610.

11th September 1611 — Shakespeare is listed in a petition to the government to repair the Stratford highways.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.229. Cf. Eccles, p.133.

5th October 1611 — Robert Johnson is listed by Alexander Aspinall as leasing a barn on Henley Street from Shakespeare.

* Eccles, p.133. The value is given as £20.

31st October 1611 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.341.

1st November 1611 — The King's Men play *The Tempest* at Whitehall in front of the King.

* EKC F&P2, pp.341–2.

5th November 1611 — The King's Men play *The Winter's Tale*.

* EKC F&P2, pp.341–2.

9th November 1611 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

19th November 1611 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

4th December 1611 — Judith Shakespeare witnesses and signs a deed of sale by Elizabeth and Adrian Quiney for a messuage to William Mountford.

* Facsimile of the signature in SS DL, p.241.

16th December 1611 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

26th December 1611 — The King's Men perform *A King and No King* for the King.

* EKC F&P2, pp.341–2.

31st December 1611 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

1612

c.1612 — *Cardenio* is written, possibly by John Fletcher and Shakespeare.

§ A play called "Cardenno" was performed before 20th May 1613 by the King's Men,[1] and one called "Cardenna" was performed on 8th June 1613.[2] On 9th September 1653, Humphrey Moseley entered "The History of Cardenio, by M^{r}. Fletcher & Shakespeare" into the Stationers' Register.[3] There is a character called *Cardenio* in the first part of Don Quixote, which was translated for the first time into English by Thomas Shelton in a book entered in the Stationers' Register on 19th January 1611 and published in 1612.[4]

This points towards there having been a play called *Cardenio*, perhaps written by Fletcher and Shakespeare, based on the character in Don Quixote and produced by the King's Men by mid 1613. The variant spellings were recorded by the preparers of the court accounts, who were not always accurate in recording names.[5] The 20th May 1613 date refers to a payment to Heminges of the King's Men for twenty plays, which Chambers dates to the Christmas 1612 period.[6] This dates the play most firmly to 1612, but the matter of attribution is much more difficult, as no original version of the play is known to exist in any manuscript or printed edition.

[1] EKC ES 4, p.127, EKC F&P2, p.343. Also in DLB 263, pp.217–227, where the 8th June 1613 entry is strangely missing. [2] EKC ES 4, p.128, EKC F&P2, p.343. Chambers includes his entry in the *Elizabethan Stage* without citing a source, and does not give it around the Chambers and Revels accounts in EKC ES 4, p.180; he does include it in *Facts and Problems*. There is a facsimile of the entry, said to be from the Revels Accounts ("Bodleian Rawl. A 239 f.47r") in Shakespeare, William and Fletcher, John [Middleton, Thomas?] (1994). Cardenio, or, the Second Maiden's Tragedy. Hamilton, Charles (ed.). p.118. [3] Facsimile of the Stationers' Register entry in Shakespeare, William and Fletcher, John [Middleton, Thomas?] (1994). Cardenio, or, the Second Maiden's Tragedy. Hamilton, Charles (ed.). p.119. Not in Arber, whose date range does not cover 1653. Chambers transcribed the name of the play here correctly as "Cardenio" in EKC ES 3, p.489, but incorrectly as "Cardennio" in EKC ES 4, p.396. He also spells Moseley as "Mosely" in the former, but "Moseley" in the latter. [4] Arber 3, p.204 / 451, and e.g. Pujante, A. Luis (1998). Double Falsehood and the Verbal Parallels with Shelton's Don Quixote. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 51. p.95 and Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1245. [5] For example, in the 20th May 1613 entry (though said by Chambers to be from the Chambers Accounts), they list

Much Ado as "Much adoe abowte nothinge" but then call it "Benidicte and Betteris" shortly after. There are many other examples. [6] EKC ES 4, p.127.

§ Moseley's 1653 entry for *Cardenio* which attributes the work to Fletcher and Shakespeare is not the only attributional evidence for the play. Lewis Theobald published a play called *Double Falsehood* in January 1728,[1] based on the Don Quixote Cardenio plot, which Theobald said he revised from a play originally written by Shakespeare. Theobald said that he had three manuscripts of the original play, one from Betterton in the hand of "M^{r}. Downes, the famous Old Prompter", and one from a "Noble Person" with the tradition "that it was given by our Author, as a Present of Value, to a Natural Daughter of his, for whose Sake he wrote it, in the Time of his Retirement from the Stage."[2] This quote is notable on historical grounds for the accuracy of dating the play to the latest period of Shakespeare's writing, at least so far as can be discerned with regard to Shelton's translation and the performances at court. The "original Manuscript" of *Double Falsehood* mentioned in the *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser* of 31st March 1770 as being "treasured up in the Museum of Covent-Garden Playhouse" refers to Theobald's version, not to the original by Fletcher and Shakespeare.[3]

There has been much debate about how much of *Double Falsehood* is by Fletcher, how much by Shakespeare, and how much by Theobald.[4] Theobald himself denied any contribution by Fletcher,[5] and seemed not to know about the earlier Stationers' Register entry by Moseley attributing it to Fletcher and Shakespeare.[6] A ten year study of the problem by Brean Hammond, for his 2010 edition of *Double Falsehood*, led him to conclude that, "over the last hundred years a definite consensus has emerged among those who have studied the evidence thoroughly, to the effect that Theobald's adaptation is indeed what remains of an otherwise lost Shakespeare–Fletcher collaboration once called *Cardenio*."[7]

[1] Theobald, Lewis [et al.?] (2010). Double Falsehood. Hammond, Brean (ed.), Arden. p.1. [2] Closely following EKC ES 3, pp.489–90. Chambers does not mention any provenance for the third copy. [3] Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser (1770). "This day is published". Issue 12,818, 31st March 1770. p.4. Theobald, Lewis [et al.?] (2010). Double Falsehood. Hammond, Brean (ed.), Arden. p.122 mentions that it is "very tempting to conclude that this reference is to a manuscript that predates any writings of Theobald's, since Theobald's own holograph would scarcely be worth treasuring up."

Stern, however, gives several good reasons to believe that the reference is to *Double Falsehood*: "this is far more likely to be a reference to Theobald's play of that name, for there is no mention here of three or four plays or of '*Cardenio*'; moreover, Covent Garden had every reason to preserve a text that had been mounted in its theatre (in 1740 and repeatedly thereafter) and none to preserve a copy of a Shakespeare play never acted there that could profitably have been sold." Stern, Tiffany (2012). 'Whether one did Contrive, the Other Write / Or one Fram'd the Plot the Other did Indite': Fletcher and Theobald as Collaborative Writers. In: Carnegie, David and Taylor, Gary (eds.). The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play. p.127. [4] Marchitello, Howard (2007). Finding Cardenio. English Literary History, 74.4. p.966. [5] Theobald, Lewis [et al.?] (2010). Double Falsehood. Hammond, Brean (ed.), Arden. p.4. [6] Marchitello, Howard (2007). Finding Cardenio. English Literary History, 74.4. p.966–7 and Theobald, Lewis [et al.?] (2010). Double Falsehood. Hammond, Brean (ed.), Arden. p.5. [7] Theobald, Lewis [et al.?] (2010). Double Falsehood. Hammond, Brean (ed.), Arden. p.94. Theobald, Lewis [et al.?] (2010). Double Falsehood. Hammond, Brean (ed.), Arden. pp.103–4 states the belief that Act 3.2 is primarily by Shakespeare, and that 4.1 and 5.2 are primarily by Fletcher, though 3.2 may incorporate small revisions by Fletcher, and 4.1 contains at least two words, vermilion and coil, used elsewhere by Shakespeare but not by Fletcher.

1612 — The third edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* is printed.

* Shakespeare, William (1612). The Passionate Pilgrime. EEBO, STC 22343.

1612 — Thomas Heywood notes that Shakespeare was "much offended with M. Jaggard" for the publication of *The Passionate Pilgrim* in 1599.

* Heywood, Thomas (1612). An Apology for Actors. EEBO, STC 13309. Sig. G4r. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.231.

1612 — John Webster writes about the right happy and copious industry of Shakespeare and others in the prefatory materials to *The White Devil*.

§ "Detraction is the sworne friend to ignorance: For mine owne part I haue euer truly cherisht my good opinion of other mens worthy Labours, especially of that full and haightned stile of Maister Chapman. The labor'd and vnderstanding workes of Maister Iohnson: The no lesse worthy composures of the both worthily excellent Maister Beamont, & Maister Fletcher: And lastly (without wrong last to be named) the right happy and copious industry of M. Shake-speare, M. Decker, & M. Heywood, wishing what I write may be read by their light: Protesting, that, in the strength of mine owne

iudgement, I know them so worthy, that though I rest silent in my owne worke, yet to most of theirs I dare (without flattery) fix that of Martiall."[1]

[1] Webster, John (1612). The White Diuel. EEBO, STC 25178. p.2.

c.1612 — An author signing himself "J.M", possibly Gervase Markham, had referred to "W.S." in a set of manuscript volumes titled *The New Metamorphosis*.

* The reference appears in a volume which was being added to in 1612. Lyon, John Henry Hobart (1919). A study of The newe Metamorphosis written by J. M., gent, 1600. p.158 attributes the work to Markham.

§ "it seemes 't is true that W. S. said, / when once he heard one courting of a Mayde,— / Beleve not thou Mens fayned flatteryes, / Lovers will tell a bushell-full of Lyes!"[1]

[1] EKC Allusions, p.89, which connects the reference stylistically to that in *Willobie his Avisa*.

1th January 1612 — The King's Men perform *The Twins' Tragedy* at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

5th January 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.341.

7th January 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

12th January 1612 — The combined Queen's and King's Men perform *The Silver Age* for the Queen and prince.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

13th January 1612 — The combined Queen's and King's Men perform *Lucrece* for the Queen and prince.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

15th January 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

3rd February 1612 — Gilbert Shakespeare, William's brother, is buried in Stratford.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.23. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.7.

9th February 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

13th February 1612 — Thomas Thorpe enters a funeral elegy attributed to "W.S." in the Stationers' Register, though this may not have been an attempt to capitalise on the popularity of Shakespeare.

* Arber 3, p.216 / 477. Cf. Burrow, Colin (ed.) (2002). The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Sonnets and Poems. p.152, and Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems. p.468. The elegy is addressed to M^r^. John Peter, and the elegy is in memory of John's brother William.

19th February 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

20th February 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

23rd February 1612 — The King's Men perform *The Nobleman* at court.

* EKC F&P2, pp.341–2.

28th February 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

28th March 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

3rd April 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

16th April 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

21st April 1612 — The King's Men perform in New Romney, and were touring the provinces.

* EKC F&P2, p.342.

26th April 1612 — The King's Men perform at court.

* EKC F&P2, p.342. It is unclear why they went to New Romney on 21st April 1612 when the court season apparently extended all through April. There is considerable uncertainty, which Chambers outlines in EKC F&P2, p.341, about these records.

11th May 1612 — Shakespeare gives evidence in the trial of Belott vs. Mountjoy, showing that he had been lodging with the Mountjoy family in around 1602.

* Facsimile of the deposition in SS DL, p.212. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.90–5.

19th June 1612 — Further depositions are taken in the case of Belott vs. Mountjoy.

* Facsimile of an extract from the record in SS DL, p.210. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.90–5.

August 1612 — The recently widowed Elizabeth Wybarn takes a party to the Globe, where Sir Ambrose Vaux attempts to abduct her claiming that he had recently married her.

* Gurr, Andrew (2004a). Playgoing in Shakespeare's London. p.243, & pp.245–6.

1613

1613 — *All is True* is written by Shakespeare and John Fletcher.

§ *All is True*, also known as *Henry VIII*, was performed at the Globe on 29th June 1613, and had been played "not passing 2 or 3 times befor" according to Henry Bluett five days later, who recorded the play performed as "All is true".[1] The theatres had not been closed,[2] and there is no other obvious reason why the play should have been written and then not performed for a long period before the first performance. *All is True* was therefore written in early to mid 1613. Due to the fact that the Globe theatre burned down during the 29th June performance, there are four accounts of the event which give details about the play. What they provide corroborates the name of the play as "All is True", and confirms that it was a play about Henry VIII.[3]

(1) "Burbage's company were acting at the Globe the play of Henry VIII"
30th June 1613 — Letter of Rev. Thomas Lorkin, to Sir Thomas Puckering.

(2) "The King's players had a new play, called All is true, representing some principal pieces of the reign of Henry VIII"
2 July 1613 — Letter of Sir Henry Wotton, to Sir Edmund Bacon.

(3) "On Tuesday last there was acted at the Globe a new play called All is Triewe, which had been acted not passing 2 or 3 times befor"
4 July 1613 — Letter of Henry Bluett, to Richard Weeks.

(4) "the house being filled with people, to behold the play, viz. of Henry the 8"
1615 — Edmund Howes and John Stow, *The Annales*.

As well as these three contemporary references and the chronicle entry, two ballads about the fire were entered into the Stationers' Register the day after, i.e. the 30th June 1613.[4] Though none of the printed versions of the ballads are extant, Chambers believes that an unattributed manuscript about the play was the one entered as being written by William Parrat. The manuscript says that everyone was scared on the day of

the fire, "and yett all this is true", alluding to the name of the play. Then the poet goes on to describe "Cardinalls might" and the "rugged face of Henry the Eight".[5]

[1] DLB 263, pp.217–227. The Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1247 edition of the play uses the title *All is True* instead of *Henry VIII* as in the First Folio; a use which is entirely justified by the contemporary reports of the performance that resulted in the destruction of the first Globe theatre. [2] The Elector Palatine's Men were allowed to play at the Fortune from 11th January 1613. EKC ES 2, p.342. Sir Robert Rich and Sir Henry Wotton took the Duke of Savoy's ambassador "to an amphitheatre in May 1613", according to Gurr, Andrew (2004a). Playgoing in Shakespeare's London. pp.83–4. It may be relevant that The Children of the Queen's Revels merged with the Lady Elizabeth's Men in March 1613, to "play in or near the City of London". Wickham, Glynne, Berry, Herbert, and Ingram, William (eds.) (2000). English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660. pp.217–8. [3] All of these references are quoted from DLB 263, pp.217–227. The Howes and Stow reference is to Howes, Edmund and Stow, John (1615). The Annales, or a Generall Chronicle of England. EEBO, STC 23338. p.926. Wotton even notes which scene caused the fire: "King Henry making a masque at the Cardinal Wolsey's house, and certain chambers being shot off at his entry, some of the paper, or other stuff, wherewith one of them was stopped, did light on the thatch". [4] Arber 3, p.241b / 528. [5] EKC ES 2, pp.420–1.

§ Foakes thought that *All is True* was first performed at court for the wedding of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine in February 1613. As Foakes himself admitted, and as McMullan points out, there is no evidence for this.[1] The main reason to doubt it is that it is strange that a play which was ready in February 1613 should then have to wait four months before being performed in public when there was competition from, for example, Henslowe who was procuring new plays at that time;[2] also there is no evidence the theatres were shut in early 1613.

[1] Shakespeare, William (2000). King Henry VIII: All is True. McMullan, Gordon (ed.), Arden. p.9. [2] EKC ES 2, p.252.

§ Aside from the two July 1613 letters explicitly calling the play *All is True*, there is no evidence that this was the name of the play. The other letter and chronicle entry mentioning the Globe fire say simply that the play was of Henry VIII, and it is of course natural to refer to a play by its main character when the original title is not known; sometimes this may happen even when the original title is known, as in the case of *Sir John Falstaff* for *1 Henry IV*. In the case of *All is True*, since no other reference to the play by that name is made, this opens the possibility that other Shakespearean

plays, especially those for which there is little external evidence before their publication in the First Folio, may have had different original titles too. *King John* is a good candidate, for example, as another English history play to which there are no references prior to the First Folio.

c.1613 — *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is written by Shakespeare and John Fletcher.

§ The earliest bound for the play is 20th February 1613, when Beaumont's *Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn* was first performed. This masque included an antimasque which is paralleled by the morris dance in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Act 3.5. Since Beaumont's antimasque was praised for its originality, it is much more likely that the morris dance derives from the antimasque than vice versa.[1]

The latest limit for the play is 31st October 1614 when Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, which includes a references to Palamon, was first performed.[2] Jonson had been working on the play since at least the summer of 1613, though the reference to Palamon could of course have been added at any time during the composition phase.

That Jonson was working on the play in 1613 is known because he read a scene of it to some of his friends. One of the people who heard the original scene was John Selden, who recalled that Jonson had created a satirical character called Inigo Lanthorne. There was a dispute about the relationship between this character and Inigo Jones, and Jonson changed the name to Lanthorn Leatherhead.[3] This character appears in 5.1, whereas the reference to Palamon appears in 4.3. It is not clear how dependant on 4.3 scene 5.1 is, and therefore how likely it is that the Palamon reference was an early part of the design. Since Jonson was reading from the fifth act of his play in the summer of 1613, however, there is no reason why the fourth act should not have been developed by then either. There is also therefore no reason why the Palamon reference should be late, though no evidence explicitly rules out this possibility either.

[1] Bertram, Paul (1961). The Date of The Two Noble Kinsmen. Shakespeare Quarterly, 12.1, Winter 1961. p.23, and e.g. Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. 2nd edition. p.1279. [2] Shakespeare, William and Fletcher, John

(2002). The Two Noble Kinsmen. Potter, Lois (ed.), Arden. p.35. [3] Riggs, David (1989). Ben Jonson: A Life. p.193. According to Butler, Martin, et al. (eds.) (1989). The Selected Plays of Ben Jonson. Vol. 2. p.531, "In naming the character Inigo Lanthorne, Selden has confused Leatherhead in Bartholomew Fair with the satire on Inigo Jones in A Tale of a Tub. V". This statement may arise from its author not having had the chance to consult Riggs, who published his work in the same year—presumably after *The Selected Plays* was completed or before the author of the note, and the editor, had a chance to read the new publication. Riggs quotes from a letter of 17th July from John Donne to Hugh Holland, where Donne says that Jonson has changed the name so that it can no longer be conflated with Inigo Jones. Riggs does not state his source, but the passage appears in e.g. Gosse, Edmund (ed.) (1899). The Life and Letters of John Donne. Vol. 2. p.16.

§ Not much is known about Shakespeare's movements in the years 1613–4 to assist in dating *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, but he was certainly in London in March 1613 purchasing property and writing an impressa for the Earl of Rutland. Shakespeare was almost certainly not present at the first performance of *Bartholomew Fair* on 31st October 1614 since he must have been in Stratford on 28th October (q.v.) to draw up a covenant with William Replingham about the enclosure row. He then rode to London on 16th November (q.v.) with Dr. John Hall, though it is not known for how long he was in London or on what business. It seems very unlikely that he would have been to London and back in the first two weeks of November only to journey back again, unless he had pressing matters to communicate between Stratford and London. He had not entirely retired to the country in these two years, therefore, and was still travelling and collaborating on drama.

c.1613 — Leonard Digges mentions Shakespeare in a manuscript note.

* Facsimile of the note in SS DL, p.256.

28th January 1613 — John Combe makes his will and leaves £5 to Shakespeare, dying on 10th July 1614.

* Facsimile of the bequest from the will in SS DL, p.187. Cf. Eccles, p.119.

4th February 1613 — Richard Shakespeare, William's younger brother, is buried in Stratford.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.23. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.7.

14th February 1613 — Princess Elizabeth is married to Frederick Elector Palatine, and the King's Men give twenty performances during the celebrations.

* Parry, Graham (1981). The Golden Age Restor'd: the Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42. p.90. Cf. also EKC F&P2, pp.342–3, and the payment to John Heminges on 20th May 1613.

10th March 1613 — Shakespeare buys a gatehouse at Blackfriars.

§ Shakespeare bought his London gatehouse with three other people, "William Johnson, citizein and Vintener of London, John Jackson and John Hemmyng of London gentlemen".[1] Shakespeare was the only one who had to pay, so the arrangement was apparently a legal device: Sir Sidney Lee noted that Anne would be denied a dower right in the gatehouse, and thought this was why only Shakespeare paid,[2] though Schoenbaum counters that Shakespeare "did not demonstrably exclude Anne from the enjoyment of his other possessions".[3] Perhaps he had some reason for wanting specifically to exclude the gatehouse. William Johnson was the landlord of the Mermaid tavern; John Jackson may be related to Elias James (cf. 24th September 1610); and Heminges was probably the King's Man and colleague of Shakespeare,[4] though Halliwell-Phillipps doubted this without stating why.[5]

[1] EKC F&P2, p.154, a transcription of the original conveyance which was found in 1796. Facsimile in SS DL, p.221. [2] Lee, Sidney (1925). A Life of William Shakespeare. 4th edition. pp.488–9, via SS CDL, p.274. [3] SS CDL, p.274. [4] SS CDL, p.273–4. Cf. Honan, p.379. [5] HP O1, p.239, via SS CDL, p.273.

§ According to Fripp, Shakespeare paid £140 for the gatehouse "to the vendor, one Henry Walker, a minstrel of London, receiving from him again £60 on mortgage."[1] Walker is called a "Minstrell of London" in the original conveyance,[2] and the biographers are quiet about him otherwise. Fripp continues of Shakespeare that he "immediately leased the house to a friend, John Robinson. We wish we knew more of Robinson." He also identifies the gatehouse tenant with the same John Robinson who was amongst the thirty one who signed a petition against the erection of a public theatre in the Liberty of Blackfriars in November 1596 (q.v.).[3] There is no evidence that Shakespeare immediately leased the house,[4] but the interest in Robinson is

nonetheless relatively high. All that is known for sure is that by 1616 the gatehouse was certainly in the usufruct possession of John Robinson.[5]

[1] Fripp M&A2, p.768, echoed in Honan, p.379. Neither Fripp nor Honan describe how a minstrel came to be in possession of such an expensive property. [2] EKC F&P2, p.154. [3] Fripp M&A2, p.768. [4] DLB 263, p.217–227 says of Shakespeare that "his will shows he leased it to a man named John Robinson." The reference in Shakespeare's will, EKC F&P2, p.173, indicates that Robinson was by then tenant of the property; but there is apparently no known evidence of tenancy prior to this. [5] EKC F&P2, p.173, from Shakespeare's will.

§ There is disagreement over whether the John Robinson to whom Shakespeare leased the gatehouse is the same John Robinson who witnesses Shakespeare's will in Stratford. Fripp, Frank E. Hill, and Ian Wilson think they are the same person.[1] Chambers, Eccles, Schoenbaum, and Honan do not.[2] If the witness Robinson is not the same as the London tenant, the leading theory is that he was a labourer of that name who is known to have been a Stratford resident.[3] Wilson's argument that the London tenant is the same as the witness is based on two points: first, that the signature of the witness is too literate to be that of a labourer; and second, that it would be strange for Shakespeare to bring a random labourer in to witness his will: "why, when only two witnesses were necessary, should some hitherto unknown local labourer have been hauled in to witness the dying Shakespeare's will?"[4]

Both of these points rest upon on the idea that if the Stratford witness was not the London tenant then he could only have been the Stratford labourer, but clearly there may simply be yet another John Robinson who has so far escaped attention. Not much is known about the Stratford Robinsons, and it may be the sparseness of the evidence which has led to the suggestion that the witness Robinson must have been a labourer. It may also be that he was simply an educated labourer. Even if the theory does hold, Honan may implicitly refute Wilson's first point when he notes that "two or three" of the witnesses' signatures are suspiciously similar and may be the hand of lawyer Collins or his clerk.[5] Honan does not, however, give his opinion on which of the signatures are similar.

On the second of Wilson's points, it is unlikely that Shakespeare would have discriminated against labourers given that his father was a glover; his family friend

Sadler, another witness to the will, was a baker; and his great rival Ben Jonson had been a bricklayer. That is to say, just because this Robinson was hitherto unknown and of a menial occupation does not rule him out as a family friend. Though Wilson's points are easy to counter, this does not mean that his theory is necessarily wrong, just that is is impossible to resolve the issue with the evidence available. The evidence does not even appear to let us weigh which is the greater possibility. Perhaps it is at least worth pointing out that there is apparently no other London witness to the will, though little is known about Robert Whatcott, so that all of the others are probably local signatories which may make it more likely that John Robinson is too. On the other hand, the London Robinson is known to have had social connections with Shakespeare. This makes the case roughly even for both scenarios.

[1] Fripp M&A2, p.768, Hill, Frank Ernest (1970). To Meet Will Shakespeare. p.230, and Wilson, Ian (1993). Shakespeare: The Evidence. p.396. [2] EKC F&P2, p.178, Eccles, p.142, SS CDL, p.306, and Honan, p.379. The collective conservative opinion of these scholars is noteworthy. [3] Notices of the Stratford John Robinsons in various works of Halliwell-Phillipps and Chambers are collected in Eccles, p.142. [4] Wilson, Ian (1993). Shakespeare: The Evidence. p.396. [5] Honan, p.397–8.

11th March 1613 — An indenture is made on Shakespeare's Blackfriars gatehouse purchase.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.225. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.157–9.

24th March 1613 — Shakespeare had devised an impresa for the 6th Earl of Rutland, which was painted by Burbage.

* EKC F&P2, p.153.

31st March 1613 — Shakespeare and Burbage are paid 44 shillings each in gold for the impressa used on 24th March.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.220. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.153.

20th May 1613 — A payment warrant is issued for performances at court of *Much Ado About Nothing* (twice), *The Tempest*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Sir John Falstaff*, *Othello*, *Julius Caesar*, *Cardenio*, and *The Hotspur*.

* Cf. 14th February 1613.

§ "Item paid to John Heminges vppon the Cowncells warrant dated att Whitehall xx^{o} die Maij 1613, for presentinge before the Princes Highnes the Lady Elizabeth and the Prince Pallatyne Elector fowerteene severall playes, viz.: one play called ffilaster, one other called the Knott of fooles, One other Much adoe abowte nothinge. The Mayeds Tragedy, The merye dyvell of Edmonton, The Tempest, A Kinge and no Kinge / The Twins Tragedie / The Winters Tale, Sir John ffalstaffe, The Moore of Venice, The Nobleman, Cæsars Tragedye / And one other called Love lyes a bleedinge, All which Playes weare played with-in the tyme of this Accompte, viz.: paid the some of iiij^{xx} xiij li vj s viij d /."[1]

"To the sayd John Heminges upon the Councells warrante dated the xxth of May 1613 for presentinge sixe severall playes before the kinges Majestie xl^{li}, and by way of his Majesties rewarde xx^{li}, in all lx^{li}"[2]

"Item paid to the said John Heminges uppon the lyke warrant: dated att Whitehall xx^{o} die Maii 1613 for presentinge sixe severall playes viz one playe called a badd begininge makes a good endinge, One other called the Capteyne, One other the Alcumist. One other Cardenno. One other The Hotspurr. And one other called Benidicte and Betteris All played within the tyme of this Accompte viz paid Fortie powndes, And by waye of his Majesties rewarde twentie powndes In all[ ]lx^{li}i"[3]

[1] Shakespeare, William (1898). The Winter's Tale. Furness, Horace Howard (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 11. pp.314–5. [2] DLB 263, pp.217–227. [3] DLB 263, pp.217–227.

8th June 1613 — The King's Men play *Cardenio* at Greenwich.

* EKC F&P2, p.343.

29th June 1613 — The Globe theatre is destroyed by fire.

* Cf. 1613, the writing of *All is True*. Accounts of the fire, described in that entry, were written on 30th June, by Rev. Thomas Lorkin; 2nd July, by Sir Henry Wotton; and 4th July, by Henry Bluett.

9th July 1613 — The King's Men receive a payment for having played *Cardenio* on the 8th June.

* EKC F&P2, p.343.

15th July 1613 — Susanna Hall, Shakespeare's daughter, opens a lawsuit about rumours that had been spread about her by John Lane.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.237. Cf. SS CDL, pp.289–90.

26th October 1613 — A new lease is signed on the Globe site.

* EKC ES 2, p.426, Wickham, Glynne, Berry, Herbert, and Ingram, William (eds.) (2000). English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660. pp.600–10, Berry, Herbert (2002). Playhouses. In: Kinney, Arthur F. (ed.). A Companion to Renaissance Drama. p.159.

1614

1614 — Shakespeare is referred to by name in a continuation to *Stowe's Annals* written by Edmund Howes and published in 1615.

* Howes, Edmund and Stow, John (1615). The Annales, or a Generall Chronicle of England. EEBO, STC 23338. p.811. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.243.

1614 — Ben Jonson alludes to Shakespeare in *Bartholomew Fair*.

* Jonson, Ben (1641). The workes of Beniamin Ionson. EEBO, STC 14754. The Induction on the Stage, Bartholomew Fair. Sigs. A5v–A6r. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.247.

c.1614 — Sir William Drummond mentions Shakespeare as having lately published his works, probably referring to *Shakespeare's Sonnets*.

* EKC Allusions, p.251.

15th February 1614 — Sir Matthew Brend promises to add nine years to the lease on the Globe site.

* Wickham, Glynne, Berry, Herbert, and Ingram, William (eds.) (2000). English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660. pp.600–10.

25th February 1614 — Alexander Cooke, one of the King's Men, is buried.

* Honigmann, E. A. J. and Brock, Susan (1993). Playhouse Wills, 1558–1642. p.96.

1st March 1614 — *The Rape of Lucrece* is transferred from John Harrison to Roger Jackson in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.248b / 542, and SS R&I, p.220.

21st March 1614 — Some time after this day, but before 30th June, a preacher stays at New Place and is entertained.

* Eccles, p.135. Entry, with fewer details about the date, in EKC F&P2, p.153. Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.230.

April 1614 — The King's Men perform in Nottingham, and also possibly performed in Coventry.

* EKC F&P2, p.345.

30th June 1614 — John Chamberlain writes a letter from London to Alice Carleton in Venice, wherein he describes the new Globe.

* Gurr, Andrew (2004c). The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642. p.30. The original Globe had burned down on 29th June 1613 (q.v.).

30th June 1614 — A book of epigrams by Thomas Freeman, one of which is about Shakespeare, is entered in the Stationers' Register.

* Arber 3, p.252 / 549.

§ "To Master W: Shakespeare.

SHakespeare, that nimble *Mercury* thy braine,
Lulls many hundred *Argus*-eyes asleepe,
So fit, for all thou fashionest thy vaine,
At th'*horse-foote* fountaine thou hast drunk full deepe,
Vertues or vices theame to thee all one is:
Who loues chaste life, there's *Lucrece* for a Teacher:
Who list read lust there's *Venus* and *Adons*,
True modell of a most lasciuious leatcher.
Besides in plaies thy wit windes like *Meander*:
When needy new-composers borrow more
Thence *Terence* doth from *Plautus* or *Menander*.
But to praise thee aright I want thy store:
Then let thine owne works thine owne worth vpraise,
And help t'adorne thee with deserued Baies."[1]

[1] Freeman, Thomas (1614). Rubbe, and A Great Cast. EEBO, STC 11370. Epigram 92, Sigs. K2 verso to K3 recto.

§ According to Anthony Wood, Shakespeare esteemed and admired Thomas Freeman and George Chapman.[1] The next epigram in Freeman's work, Epigram 93, is entitled "To his worthy friend Maister Heywood, of his Gold and Siluer Age", which may further explain the social connection with Shakespeare, given that Heywood and Shakespeare were plausibly friends.

[1] Halliwell, James Orchard (1848). The Life of William Shakespeare. p.333.

9th July 1614 — Stratford catches fire once again, the blaze destroying over fifty houses.

* Eccles, p.135.

10th July 1614 — John Combe, the wealthiest citizen of Stratford, dies, and leaves £5 to Shakespeare in his will.

* Eccles, p.119. Cf. 28th January 1613 for the writing of Combe's will.

§ Shakespeare is said to have written a palinode retracting an earlier epitaph describing Combe's usury:

Howe'er he lived judge not,
John Combe shall never be forgot
While poor hath memory, for he did gather
To make the poor his issue; he their father,
As record of his tilth and seeds
Did crown him in his latter deeds.[1]

The earlier epitaph is widely recorded by independent, early sources. This palinode is not so well represented in the records, but it is true that Combe left money to the poor, and so the story may be genuine. If so, then it is the last verse that Shakespeare is known to have written. Combe had left £100 as funds for poor tradesmen, a further £20 to the poor of Stratford, £5 to the poor of Warwick, and £5 to the poor of Alcester.[2] Shakespeare left £10 to the poor of Stratford,[3] though Combe seems to have been the more wealthy of the two. Combe also gave money to his godson John

Collins, who was the son of Francis Collins of Warwick, presumably the same Francis Collins who was Shakespeare's lawyer and prepared his will.[4]

[1] Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems. p.455, recorded by Nicholas Burghe in about 1650. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.139. [2] Halliwell, James Orchard (1848). The Life of William Shakespeare. p.238. [3] EKC F&P2, p.172. [4] Halliwell, James Orchard (1848). The Life of William Shakespeare. p.238 where Francis Collins is said to be of Warwick, and in EKC F&P2, p.172 the Francis Collins to whom Shakespeare bequeaths money is said to be of the borough of Warwick. Chambers in EKC F&P2, p.174 says that the text "is probably in the hand of a clerk employed by Francis Collins, a solicitor of Warwick, who no doubt drafted the will".

5th September 1614 — Thomas Greene, draws up a list of "Auncient ffreeholders in the ffieldes of Old Stratford and Welcombe", the earliest known reference to the great enclosure row in Stratford.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.231. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.141.

23rd September 1614 — The town council of Stratford meets and unanimously votes against enclosure.

* SS CDL, p.283.

28th October 1614 — Shakespeare draws up a covenant with enclosure proponent Arthur Mainwaring's cousin, William Replingham, regarding enclosure.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.232. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.141–2.

16th November 1614 — Shakespeare and Dr. John Hall go to London.

* EKC F&P2, p.142.

17th November 1614 — Thomas Greene records that Shakespeare and Dr. John Hall were in London.

* Facsimile of the note in SS DL, p.233, and facsimile and transcript in SS R&I, pp.76–7. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.142–3.

23rd December 1614 — Thomas Greene makes another entry in his diary about the enclosure row in Stratford mentioning Shakespeare.

* Facsimile and transcript in SS R&I, pp.78–9. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.143.

1615

9th January 1615 — Thomas Greene records in his diary that "Mr. Replingham, 28 Octobris, articled with Mr. Shakspear".

* Facsimile and transcript in SS R&I, pp.80–1. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.143.

11th January 1615 — Thomas Greene records another entry mentioning Shakespeare in his diary.

* Facsimile and transcript in SS R&I, pp.82–3. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.143.

29th March 1615 — The King's Men are commanded to stop performing during Lent; Shakespeare's name does not appear in the list of those with the company.

* Greg, W. W. (ed.) (1911). Collections, Parts IV & V. Malone Society Collections, 1.4 & 1.5. p.372. This manuscript was printed by Collier; there is no suggestion of Collier forgery in Freeman, Arthur, and Freeman, Janet Ing (2004). John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century. Vols. 1&2.

26th April 1615 — A Bill of Complaint is made relating to Shakespeare's Blackfriars gatehouse.

* EKC F&P2, p.159–61.

5th May 1615 — An answer is made to the Bill of Complaint relating to Shakespeare's Blackfriars gatehouse.

* EKC F&P2, p.161–3.

22nd May 1615 — A decree is made in the case of Bendish and Newport vs. Bacon, which concerns Shakespeare's Blackfriars gatehouse.

* EKC F&P2, p.163–4.

c.June 1615 — Margaret Wheeler's illegitimate child with Thomas Quiney, who would marry Shakespeare's daughter Judith the next year, is conceived.

* Cf. 15th March 1616.

September 1615 — Thomas Greene makes a confusing entry in his diary concerning Shakespeare.

* Facsimile and transcript in SS R&I, pp.86–7. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.143. The entry reads "Sept W Shakspeares tellyng J Greene that I was not able to [d. he] beare the encloseinge of Welcombe." (Schoenbaum, reproducing a transcript by Edward Scott), or "Sept. W Shakspeares tellyng J Greene that J was not able to beare the encloseinge of Welcombe." (Chambers). The "I" or "J" letter is probably the former: it matches very closely the capital "I" in "Sr Arthur Ingram" later on the page.

5th September 1615 — Thomas Greene records another entry in his diary that may refer to Shakespeare.

* Facsimile and transcript in SS R&I, pp.86–7. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.143.

c.9th October 1615 — On around this day, Thomasina Ostler makes a plea in the suit of Ostler vs. Heminges, which provides some information about the Globe and Blackfriars.

* EKC F&P2, pp.58–64.

30th November 1615 — Robert Armin, of the King's Men, is buried.

* Honigmann, E. A. J. and Brock, Susan (1993). Playhouse Wills, 1558–1642. p.98.

1616

1616 — *The Scornful Ladie* by Beaumont and Fletcher, which contains a probable reference to Shakespeare as "Our Comick Poet", is printed.

* Beaumont, Francis and Fletcher, John (1616). The Scornful Ladie. EEBO, STC 1686. Sig. C4r. Cf. EKC Allusions, p.229.

c.January 1616 — Shakespeare makes a draft of his will.

* "In or before January", according to EKC F&P2, p.175.

c.February 1616 — Shakespeare Quiney is conceived to Judith and Thomas Quiney.

* Cf. his birth, 23rd November 1616.

10th February 1616 — Judith Shakespeare, William's daughter, is married to Thomas Quiney.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.239. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.7.

§ "On February 10, 1616 only two months before her father's death, she married, without a license, during Lent (a prohibited season), Thomas Quiney, who was four years her junior."[1]

[1] Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). The Shakespeare Documents. Vol. 2. p.521.

c.12th March 1616 — Thomas Quiney, and possibly Judith Quiney, are excommunicated.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.239. Cf. SS CDL, p.293. Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). The Shakespeare Documents. Vol. 2. p.521 says of Judith: "She was excommunicated about March 12, 1616." Cf. 26th March 1616.

15th March 1616 — Margaret Wheeler and her illegitimate child by Thomas Quiney had died in childbirth, and mother and child are buried together.

§ The burial register records "Margret Wheelar & her Child", which shows, with the absence of any baptismal record for the child, that this was a still birth.[1] Unfortunately the case pertaining to Wheeler and Quiney was not subjected to scrutiny by Mark Eccles, since the discovery of the relevant archives was only made a few years after his landmark study.[2] Duncan-Jones intimates that Margaret was of the family of John Wheeler who had been bailiff in 1565 and 1576,[3] but supplies no evidence for this. The most likely candidate corresponding to her in the records is the Margaret Wheeler baptised on 3rd September 1586, the daughter of Randall Wheeler, a carter.[4] This would make her 29 in early 1616, and just a few years older than Quiney.

[1] Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.240. Cf. Savage, Richard (1905). The Registers of Stratford-on-Avon in the County of Warwick. Vol. 3, Burials 1558–1622-3. Parish Register Society. p.90. [2] Hanley, Hugh H. (1964). Shakespeare's Family in Stratford Records. Times Literary Supplement, 21st May. p.441 made the announcement. [3] Duncan-Jones, Katherine (2001). Ungentle Shakespeare. p.271 and Eccles, p.42. [4] Greer, Germaine (2007). Shakespeare's Wife. p.311 and Mitchell, Reg (2007). Tho: Quiney - Gent. pp.50–1.

25th March 1616 — Shakespeare makes a revision to finalise his will.

* Facsimile of the will in SS DL, pp.243–5. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.175.

26th March 1616 — Thomas Quiney is tried for fornication in the ecclesiastical or bawdy court.

* Facsimile of the record in SS DL, p.240.

§ The bawdy court was the colloquial name for the ecclesiastical court which dealt with lapses of sexual morality, drinking on the sabbath, marrying without a license, and other such offences of a bawdy nature.[1] Thomas admitted to the judge, the vicar John Rogers, that he had "carnal copulation" with Margaret Wheeler.[2] This was his offence; the record does not say anything about Judith, nor does it address whether or not she and Thomas were betrothed when the copulation took place. The court did mete out a particularly severe punishment: a humiliating public penance in front of family, friends, and neighbours in the church dressed in a white penance sheet for three successive Sundays. Quiney asked for this punishment to be remitted, and it was

commuted for a private penance; he also had to pay the large sum of 5s, however, for the use of the poor of the parish.[3] Though this was a large fine, it is perhaps notable that it was only half the figure that Thomas Burman had to pay for the same offence in 1608.[4]

[1] SS CDL, p.293 and Brinkworth, E. R. C. (1972). Shakespeare and the Bawdy Court of Stratford. pp.120–74. [2] Cf. c.June 1615 and 15th March 1616. [3] The facts about the case are derived from the translation of the record in Brinkworth, E. R. C. (1972). Shakespeare and the Bawdy Court of Stratford. p.143. [4] Brinkworth, E. R. C. (1972). Shakespeare and the Bawdy Court of Stratford. p.142.

17th April 1616 — William Hart, Shakespeare's brother-in-law, is buried.

* EKC F&P2, p.8.

23rd April 1616 — William Shakespeare dies.

* SS CDL, p.296.

§ The only record of how Shakespeare may have died is recorded in the diary of Rev. John Ward, vicar of Stratford, in c.1661, forty-five years after the event. Ward writes that "Shakespear, Drayton, and Ben Jhonson had a merry meeting, and itt seems drank too hard, for Shakespear died of a feavour there contracted."[1]

A good attempt verify the credibility of this story based on internal evidence was made by Basil Brown in 1921. Brown observes that Drayton himself mentions drinking mildly; that Jonson on the other hand is well known for drinking too much; that Drayton was perhaps not all that fond of Jonson, though they were connected in having written pieces together prior to 1616; and that Drayton did not much like theatre in general.[2] The piece where Drayton mentions drinking mildly is only a reference to drinking with one specific friend, and does not of course preclude his having drunk more deeply with other friends, or more substantially at other times in his life. He could also have simply been avoiding printing the fact that he was an occasional binge drinker, and it is possible that he attended a merry meeting in which much drinking occurred without himself having drunk much or any at all, so of

course it is difficult to take this as evidence either way, except that it shows that Drayton was not a teetotaler.

In *The Vision of Ben. Ionson, On the Mvses of his Friend M. Drayton*, published as a commendatory poem in a work of Drayton's from 1627, Jonson says of Drayton that "'Tis true: / You haue not writ to me, nor I to you".[3] Basil Brown observes that, read literally, this makes it sound as though Jonson and Drayton didn't really know one another until this point.[4] But the context makes it much more likely that Jonson meant that they had never before written public commendatory verses upon one another, since Jonson goes on to say that he is starting now, in publishing this Vision. It is also possible that personal correspondence is meant.

There is certainly evidence that Jonson and Drayton knew one another prior to 1618. In Jonson's conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden, Jonson references Drayton several times. The most pertinent of these mentions is the first, where under his "acquaintance and behaviour with Poets living with him", Drummond records that "Drayton feared him; and he esteemed not of him".[5] This seems to indicate that they resided together, but that they did not get on at that time. Later Drummond says that Sir W. Alexander was not particularly kind to Jonson because he was a friend of Drayton's.[6]

Though this was the case in 1618, it appears later to have changed. Drayton provides Jonson the most glowing commendation in an epistle where he also writes about Shakespeare,[7] and this underlines the possibility that by 1627 they were quite good friends. That Shakespeare is given relatively short shrift in this epistle may simply be due to the then apparently common notion that Jonson was the better writer, and Shakespeare a secondary figure. Marlowe is given better commendation, and Drayton does not mention Fletcher in this short review of great recent authors at all.

On the basis of the Drummond conversations, the story of the merry meeting is made slightly implausible, but not impossible. After all, it does appear that Jonson may actually have lodged with Drayton, so even if they did not get along it appears they

could be found in the same room as one another. That they later became apparently good friends also goes to show that there was no insuperable rift between them.

[1] Noticed and published for the first time in Severn, Charles (ed.) (1839). Diary of the Rev. John Ward, A. M. p.61. [2] Brown, Basil (1921). Law Sports at Gray's Inn (1594). pp.73–5. [3] Jonson, Ben (1627). The Vision of Ben Ionson. In Drayton, Michael (1627). The Battaile of Agincourt. EEBO, STC 7190. Sig. A2/p.2 [4] Brown, Basil (1921). Law Sports at Gray's Inn (1594). pp.73–5. [5] Sidney, Philip (ed.) (1906). Conversations of Ben Jonson with William Drummond of Hawthornden. p.21. [6] Sidney, Philip (ed.) (1906). Conversations of Ben Jonson with William Drummond of Hawthornden. p.22. [7] Drayton, Michael (1627). The Battaile of Agincourt. EEBO, STC 7190. p.206. Cf. Terry, Richard G. (2001). Poetry and the Making of the English Literary Past, 1660–1781. pp.49–50. In discussing the inconsistency of Drayton's list, Terry refers to Thomas Nashe as not deserving of inclusion. Terry is not, therefore, adequately acquainted with the works of Nashe.

25th April 1616 — William Shakespeare is buried.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.250. Cf. EKC F&P2, p.8.

22nd June 1616 — Shakespeare's will is proved in London by Dr. John Hall, and possibly Susanna Hall, in the presence of William Byrde.

* Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). The Shakespeare Documents. Vol. 2. p.495, "The phrase cum venerit ('when she shall come') as applied to Susanna suggests that she was not present when John Hall 'exhibited' the will in the Prerogative Court in London on June 22, 1616."

July 1616 — Thomas Quiney swaps houses with his brother-in-law William Chandler.

* SS CDL, p.294.

23rd November 1616 — Shakespeare Quiney, son of Thomas Quiney and Shakespeare's daughter Judith, is baptised.

* EKC F&P2, p.8. Cf. 8th May 1617, the burial of Shakespeare Quiney. The baptismal record spells his forename "Shaksper", and the burial record spells his forename "Shakespere". Normalisation to "Shakespeare" is conducted on the basis of the obvious reference of the forename to Judith's maiden name.

1617

16th February 1617 — *Venus and Adonis* is transferred in the Stationers' Register from William Leake to William Barrett.

* Arber 3, p.279 / 603, and the facsimile in SS R&I, p.210.

14th March 1617 — Dr. John Hall is elected a burgess of Stratford, but declines the position citing his professional duty.

* Fripp, Edgar Innes (1930). Shakespeare Studies, Biographical and Literary. p.168, "Three times he was elected a Chief Burgess (on 14 March 1617, less than a year after Shakespeare's death, probably as the new master of New Place; on 14 February 1623, and on 25 May 1632)". Also mentioned in Joseph, Harriet (1976). John Hall: Man and Physician. p.9.

May 1617 — Thomas Greene, probably disheartened by the enclosure row, resigns from the Corporation of Stratford, sells his tithes, and moves out of the town to Bristol; Francis Collins, Shakespeare's solicitor, succeeds him.

* Whitfield, Christopher (1964). Four Town Clerks of Stratford on Avon, 1603–1625. Notes and Queries, 11.7. p.251. Cf. Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). The Shakespeare Documents. Vol. 2. p.457, the letter of 22nd May 1617.

18th April 1617 — Susanna Hall takes admittance of the copyhold on the Chapel Lane cottage.

* EKC F&P2, p.112.

8th May 1617 — Shakespeare Quiney, son of Thomas Quiney and Shakespeare's daughter Judith, is buried.

* EKC F&P2, p.8. Cf. 23rd November 1616, the baptism of Shakespeare Quiney.

1618

9th February 1618 — Richard Quiney, son of Thomas and Judith, is baptised.

* EKC F&P2, p.8.

6th April 1618 — The King's Men perform *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*.

* EKC F&P2, p.346.

7th April 1618 — The King's Men perform *The Winter's Tale*.

* EKC F&P2, p.346.

20th April 1618 — John Heminges receives a payment for the King's Men for performing on 6th and 7th April.

* EKC F&P2, p.346.

1st November 1618 — Michael Hart, son of William Hart and Shakespeare's sister Joan, is buried.

* EKC F&P2, p.8.

1619

1619 — William Jaggard and Thomas and Issac Pavier publish a series of Shakespeare quartos in a collection sometimes referred to as the "false folio".

* Halliday, F. E. (1952). A Shakespeare Companion. p.320.

1619 — Ben Jonson tells William Drummond of Hawthornden that Shakespeare lacked art, and that he made a mistake in *The Winter's Tale*

* Sidney, Philip (ed.) (1906). Conversations of Ben Jonson with William Drummond of Hawthornden. pp.13 and 26, and EKC Allusions, p.274.

c.1619 — *The Winter's Tale*, the *Two Noble Kinsmen*, *Hamlet*, and 2 *Henry IV* are mentioned on slips of waste paper probably from the Revels Office.

* EKC F&P2, p.346.

28th April 1619 — Heminges and Condell answer in a suit of Witter vs. Heminges and Condell, and mention details of Shakespeare's share of the Globe.

* EKC F&P2, pp.52–7.

3rd May 1619 — The Lord Chamberlain stops the unauthorised publication of some Shakespeare quartos.

* Murphy, Andrew (2003). Shakespeare in Print: a History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing. p.40.

20th May 1619 — The King's Men perform *Pericles*.

* EKC F&P2, p.346.

8th July 1619 — *The Merchant of Venice* is transferred in the Stationers' Register from Thomas Hayes to Laurence Hayes.

* Arber 3, p.651, and SS R&I, p.220.

1620

1620 — John Taylor, the water poet, mentions Shakespeare.

* EKC Allusions, p.278.

23rd January 1620 — Thomas Quiney, son of Thomas and Shakespeare's daughter Judith, is baptised.

* EKC F&P2, p.8.

1621

6th October 1621 — *Othello* is entered in the Stationers' Register.*

* Arber 4, p.21 / 59, and SS R&I, p.221. Cf. Honigmann, E. A. J. (1996). The Texts of Othello and Shakespearian Revision. p.2 & p.30.

1622

1622 — The first quarto of *Othello* is printed, and Shakespeare is mentioned by Thomas Walkley in the preface.

* EKC Allusions, pp.292–3.

21st February 1622 — Matthew Brend takes control of the Globe site.

* Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield (1927). The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. p.105. EKC ES 2, p.426 refers to him as Matthew Brend, not Sir Matthew, for this action; he came into his majority in this year and was knighted.

25th March 1622 — The back of a lease document mentions Shakespeare.

* HP O2, pp.126–7.

1623

1623 — Shakespeare's monument in Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-upon-Avon, had by now been erected.

§ In his poem to the memory of Shakespeare in the First Folio, Leonard Digges mentions Shakespeare's "Stratford Moniment".[1] This probably refers to the existing monument, since William Dugdale made a sketch of it in 1632,[2] and John Weever had transcribed the epitaphs on it in around the 1620s.[3] Stanley Wells, and Diana Price, have argued that the epitaph on the monument, which describes Shakespeare incorrectly as "PLAST / WITH IN THIS MONUMENT", refers to an original conception of the monument as surmounting a tomb for Shakespeare.[4] They argue that the project was then scaled back, and the monument placed on the wall with the now inconsistent self-referential epitaph. The scaling back probably occurred before the publication of the First Folio, if so, because Ben Jonson refers to Shakespeare as a "Moniment, without a tombe".[5] Jonson's line immediately follows a section responding to another poem which had suggested that Shakespeare be buried in Westminster Abbey. This other poem is usually thought to have been written by William Basse, but Brandon S. Centerwall attributes it to John Donne, and argues that it was written when plans for Shakespeare's funerary legacy were still being debated.[6]

[1] Preface to Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. [2] Price, Diana (1997). Reconsidering Shakespeare's Monument. Review of English Studies, 48.190. p.180, who argues strongly that the monument that Dugdale sketched is the same as that of present. [3] Honigmann, E. A. J. (1987). John Weever. p.70 says that Weever had anticipated Dugdale "by thirty years", which Price, Diana (1997). Reconsidering Shakespeare's Monument. Review of English Studies, 48.190. p.180 takes to be an approximation but renders as "c.1626". [4] Wells, Stanley (1995). Flyleaf. In: the Daily Telegraph, 22nd April 1995. Section A8, Wells, Stanley (2003). Shakespeare: For All Time. p.48, and Price, Diana (1997). Reconsidering Shakespeare's Monument. Review of English Studies, 48.190. pp.180–2. [5] Preface to Shakespeare, William (1623). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201. [6] Centerwall, Brandon S. (2006). Who Wrote William Basse's 'Elegy on Shakespeare'?: Rediscovering a Poem Lost from the Donne Canon. Shakespeare Survey, Vol. 59. pp.267–84.

1623 — M^r^. *William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies*, commonly known as the First Folio, is published.

* It was entered into the Stationers' Register on 8th November, cf. Arber 4, p.69 / 107, and SS R&I, p.221. Cf. Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). The Shakespeare Documents. Vol. 2. p.550. Ben Jonson, John Heminges, Henry Condell, Hugh Holland, Leonard Digges, and "I.M." (possibly James Mabbe) contributed prefatory material to the work.

2nd February 1623 — The King's Men perform *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*.

* Bawcutt, N. W. (1996). The Control and Censorship of Caroline Drama. p.140, and EKC F&P2, p.346.

14th February 1623 — Dr. John Hall is elected a burgess of Stratford, but declines the position.

* Fripp, Edgar Innes (1930). Shakespeare Studies, Biographical and Literary. p.168, "Three times he was elected a Chief Burgess (on 14 March 1617, less than a year after Shakespeare's death, probably as the new master of New Place; on 14 February 1623, and on 25 May 1632)". Also mentioned in Joseph, Harriet (1976). John Hall: Man and Physician. p.9.

6th August 1623 — Anne Shakespeare dies.

* EKC F&P2, p.9.

8th August 1623 — Anne Shakespeare is buried.

* Facsimile of the Parish Register entry in SS DL, p.260. Cf. EKC F&P2, pp.8–9.

§ On 10th April 1693, a Mr. Dowdall wrote to Edward Southwell enclosing anecdotes about Shakespeare.[1] Dowdall wrote about the inscriptions regarding Shakespeare in Holy Trinity, Stratford, and provided two specific details: (a) that Shakespeare was apprenticed to a butcher and ran off to the stage, and (b) that his wife and daughters wanted to be buried with him but were not for fear of the curse. These details are said by Dowdall to be from "the clarke that shew'd me this Church", who was "aboue 80 y^rs^ old". Chambers says that this clerk was no doubt the William Castle who he discovered was baptised in Stratford on 17th July 1614.[2] The ultimate source of the identification of the clerk as Castle, which is not cited by Chambers, Duncan-Jones, or

Woudhuysen[3] (who calls this identification "presumably" correct), may be Halliwell-Phillipps, who obtained this information from the Stratford Vestry-book.[4]

Robert Bearman uncovered some details about Dowdall in 2000, including his forename, John.[5] Chambers had written that he does "not know why Lee 25, 642, calls Dowdall 'John'."[6] The reason is that Dowdall's letter is signed "John at Stiles",[7] though this was a jocular reference. Bearman found "John at Stiles" to be a common suit at law pseudonym of the period, and through a web of evidence finds Dowdall to have been entered into Middle Temple on 26th November 1684, and to be the son of one Patrick Dowdall. Collier is said by Bearman to have been the first to guess that Dowdall's forename was John, based on the signature, in the introduction to the 1838 pamphlet in which the letter was first published.[8] But this pamphlet was not attributed on the title page, and Freeman and Freeman believe the introduction to have been more likely written by the publisher, Thomas Rodd.[9] The introduction also does not contain any suggestion that Dowdall's forename was John.

[1] Facsimile of extracts from the letter in SS DL, p.262. Cf. Bearman, Robert (2000). 'Mr Dowdall' Revealed. Notes and Queries, 47.2, June 2000. p.188. [2] From the transcription of the letter and accompanying notes in EKC F&P2, p.259. [3] Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems. p.462. [4] HP O1, p.xi for the identification, and HP O2, p.288 for the use of the Stratford Vestry-book, from which Halliwell-Phillipps had published some excerpts in 1865. Cf. Lamborn, E. A. G. and Harrison, G. B. (1924). Shakespeare: The Man and his Stage. p.33 who refers to the Stratford Vestry-book but not to Halliwell-Phillipps. The Vestry-book was published in full in 1900, and a reference to Castle as clerk and sexton in 1695 is made in Arbuthnot, George (1900). The Vestry Minute-Book of the Parish of Stratford-Upon-Avon from 1617 to 1699 AD. pp.148–9. Castle is said there to be of "great age", and appears based on Arbuthnot, George (1900). The Vestry Minute-Book of the Parish of Stratford-Upon-Avon from 1617 to 1699 AD. p.113 to have held at least the office of sexton since 1st December 1680. [5] Bearman, Robert (2000). 'Mr Dowdall' Revealed. Notes and Queries, 47.2, June 2000. p.188. [6] EKC F&P2, p.259. [7] Schoenbaum, S. (1991). Shakespeare's Lives. pp.255–6. EKC F&P2, p.259 merely attributes it to T. Rodd, the printer. [8] Anon (1838). Traditionary Anecdotes of Shakespeare. p.19. Bearman does not attribute this work to Collier directly, but refers to Schoenbaum, S. (1991). Shakespeare's Lives. pp.255–6 where the attribution is made. There is no attribution to Collier on the original title page. [9] Freeman, Arthur, and Freeman, Janet Ing (2004). John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century. Vol. 1. p.1395.

Bibliography of Sources

Primary sources

Primary manuscript sources

Harley MS 5353, British Museum.

MS Coram Rege Roll, Easter, 42 Eliz. 1600.

Primary printed sources

Anon (1591). *Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England*. EEBO, STC 14644.

Anon (1594). *A Knack to Know a Knave*. EEBO, STC 15027.

Anon (1595). *A Quest of Enquirie*. EEBO, STC 18758.

Anon (1603a). *A Mournefull Dittie*. EEBO, STC 7589.

Anon (1603b). *A Trve Report of the Most Tryumphant, and Royall Accomplishment of the Baptisme of the Most Excellent, Right High, and Mightie Prince, Henry Fredericke*. EEBO, STC 11214.8.

Anon (1605). *The true chronicle history of King Leir*. EEBO, STC 15343.

Anon [Chettle, Henry] (1603). *Englands Mourning Garment*. EEBO, STC 5122.

Anon [Peele, George and Shakespeare, William] (1594). *The most lamentable Romaine tragedie of Titus Andronicus*. EEBO, STC 22328.

Anon [Shakespeare, William, et al.] (1594). *The Taming of a Shrew*. EEBO, STC 23667.

Anon [Shakespeare, William] (1594). *The First Part of the Contention*. EEBO, STC 26099.

Anon [Shakespeare, William] (1595). *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*. EEBO, STC 21006.

Anon [Shakespeare, William] (1619). *The Whole Contention*. EEBO, STC 26101.

Armin, Robert (1609). *The Italian Tailor and his Boy*. EEBO, STC Reel 867:14.

Barkstead, William (1607). *Mirrha, the Mother of Adonis*. EEBO, STC 1429.

Beaumont, Francis and Fletcher, John (1616). *The Scornful Ladie*. EEBO, STC 1686.

Burton, Robert (1621). *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. EEBO, STC 4159.

Camden, William (1605). *Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine*. EEBO, STC 4521.

Camden, William (1614). *Remaines Concerning Britaine*. EEBO, STC 4522.

Chapman, George (1598). *Seauen Bookes of the Iliades of Homere*. EEBO, STC 13632.

Chettle, Henry (1592). *Kind-Heart's Dream*. EEBO, STC 5123.

Clement, Francis (1587). *The Petie Schole with an English Orthographie*. EEBO, STC 5400.

Colse, Peter (1596). *Penelope's Complaint*. EEBO, STC 5582.

Davies, John (1603). *Microcosmos*. EEBO, STC 6333.

Davies, John (1609). *Humours Heau'n on Earth with the Ciuile Warres of Death and Fortune*. EEBO, STC 6332.

Dekker, Thomas and Wilkins, George (1607). *Iests to Make you Merie*. EEBO, STC 6541.

Eliot, John (1593). *Ortho-epia Gallica*. EEBO, STC 7574.

Freeman, Thomas (1614). *Rubbe, and A Great Cast*. EEBO, STC 11370.

Greene, Robert (1592). *Greene's Groats-Worth of Wit*. EEBO, STC 12245.

Hardyng, John (1543). *The chronicle of Ihon Hardyng in metre*. EEBO, STC 12766.7.

Harvey, Gabriel (1592). *Four Letters, and Certain Sonnets*. EEBO, STC 12900.5.

Heywood, Thomas (1612). *An Apology for Actors*. EEBO, STC 13309.

Holland, Philemon (tr.) (1601). *The Historie of the World*. EEBO, STC 20029.

Holland, Philemon (tr.) (1603). *The philosophie, commonlie called, the morals written by the learned philosopher Plutarch of Chaeronea*. EEBO, STC 20063.

Howes, Edmund and Stow, John (1615). *The Annales, or a Generall Chronicle of England*. EEBO, STC 23338.

I. C. [Cresswell, Joseph?] (1603). *Saint Marie Magdalens Conuersion*. EEBO, STC 4282.

Jonson, Ben (1616). *The workes of Beniamin Ionson*. EEBO, STC 14752.

Kempe, William (1588). *The Education of Children in Learning*. EEBO, STC 14926.

Lyly, John (1592). *Midas*. EEBO, STC 17083.

Meres, Francis (1598). *Palladis Tamia*. EEBO, STC 17834.

Morley, Thomas (1600). *The First Booke of Ayres*. EEBO, STC 18115.5.

Nashe, Thomas (1592). *Pierce Penilesse his supplication to the diuell*. EEBO, STC 18372.

Owen, John (1606). *Epigrammatum Libri Tres*. EEBO, STC 18984.5 and 18984.7.

Pont, Robert (1599). *Against sacrilege*. EEBO, STC 20100.

Saviolo, Vincentio (1595). *Vincentio Saviolo his Practice*. EEBO, STC 21788.

Sc., An. [Anthony Scoloker?] (1604). *Diaphantus*. EEBO, STC 21853.

Sh., W. [Anon] (1611). *The first and second part of the troublesome raigne of Iohn King of England*. EEBO, STC 14646.

Shakespeare, William (1599). *Romeo and Juliet*. EEBO, STC 22323.

Shakespeare, William (1600a). *A Midsommer Nights Dreame*. British Library, STC 22302.

Shakespeare, William (1600b). *The Second Part of Henrie the Fourth*. EEBO, STC 22288.

Shakespeare, William (1602). *Syr Iohn Falstaffe, and the Merrie Wiues of Windsor*. British Library, STC 22299.

Shakespeare, William (1603). *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke*. EEBO, STC 22275.

Shakespeare, William (1608). *True Chronicle Historie of the life and death of King Lear*. EEBO, STC 22292.

Shakespeare, William (1609a). *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. EEBO, STC 22334.

Shakespeare, William (1609b). *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. EEBO, STC 22335.

Shakespeare, William (1609c). *The Famous Historie of Troylus and Cresseid*. EEBO, STC 22332.

Shakespeare, William (1612). *The Passionate Pilgrime*. EEBO, STC 22343.

Shakespeare, William (1623). *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies*. Meisei, MR 774 Lee 53 / West 201.

Shakespeare, William [Anon] (1605). *The London Prodigal*. EEBO, STC 22333.

Shakespeare, William [Anon] (1622). *The first and second part of the troublesome raigne of Iohn King of England*. EEBO, STC 14647.

Spenser, Edmund (1579). *The shepheardes calender*. EEBO, STC 23089.

Spenser, Edmund (1595). *Amoretti and Epithalamion*. EEBO, STC 23076.

Twine, Lawrence (1594). *The Patterne of Painefull Aduentures*. EEBO, STC 709.

Twine, Lawrence (1607). *The Patterne of Paineful Aduentures*. EEBO, STC 710.

Warner, William (1606). *A Continuance of Albions England*. EEBO, STC 25085.

Webster, John (1612). *The White Diuel*. EEBO, STC 25178.

Weever, John (1599). *Epigrammes*. EEBO, STC 25224.

Wilkins, George (1606). *The Historie of Iustine*. EEBO, STC 24293.

Wilkins, George (1607). *The Miseries of Inforst Mariage*. EEBO, STC 25635.

Wilkins, George (1608). *The Painfull Aduentures of Pericles Prince of Tyre*. EEBO, STC 25638.5.

Willoughby, Henry (1594). *Willobie his Avisa*. EEBO, STC 25755.

Willoughby, Henry (1605). *Willobie his Avisa*. EEBO, STC 25756.

Secondary sources

A

Abrams, Richard (2007). Oldys, Motteux, and 'the Play'rs old motto': the 'Totus Mundus' Conundrum Revisited. *Theatre Notebook*, 61.3. pp.122–31.

Ackroyd, Peter (2005). *Shakespeare: The Biography.*

Adams, Joseph Quincy (1923). *A Life of William Shakespeare.*

Adlard, J. E. (1866). Review of An Historical Account of the New Place. *The British Controversialist and Literary Magazine*. Vol. 8. pp.143–9.

Alexander, Peter (1969). The Original Ending of The Taming of the Shrew. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 20.2. pp.111–6.

Ames, Joseph (1749). *Typographical Antiquities.* Vol. 2.

Anders, Henry R. D. (1904). *Shakespeare's Books.*

Anon (1838). *Traditionary Anecdotes of Shakespeare.*

Anon (1891). *Pimlyco, or, Runne Red-Cap.* Bullen, Arthur Henry (ed.).

Anon (1963). *A Knack to Know a Knave.* Proudfoot, G. R. (ed.).

Anon [Conway, M. D.] (1864). Mr. William Shakespeare, At Home. *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, 29.171. pp.337–46.

Anon [Yorke, Philip] (1778). *Miscellaneous State Papers.* Vol. 1.

Arbuthnot, George (1900). *The Vestry Minute-Book of the Parish of Stratford-Upon-Avon from 1617 to 1699 AD.*

Ashley, L. R. N. (1970). *George Peele.*

Aubrey, John (1982). *Brief Lives.* Barber, Richard W. (ed.).

B

Baker, John (1972). Coke's Note-Books and the Sources of His Reports. *Cambridge Law Journal*, 30.1. pp.59–86.

Baldwin, T. W. (1944). *William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke.* Vol. 1.

Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield (1927). *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company.*

Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield (1957). *Shakspere's Love's Labor's Won: New Evidence from the*

Account Books of an Elizabethan Bookseller.

Barroll, John Leeds (1991). *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater.*

Baskervill, Charles Read (1911). *English Elements in Jonson's Early Comedy.*

Bate, Jonathan (1993). *Shakespeare and Ovid.*

Bate, Jonathan (2008). *Soul of the Age.*

Bawcutt, N. W. (1996). *The Control and Censorship of Caroline Drama.*

Baynes, Thomas Spencer (1896). *Shakespeare Studies and Essay on English Dictionaries.*

Beal, Peter (2008). *A Dictionary of English Manuscript Terminology.*

Bearman, Robert (2000). 'Mr Dowdall' Revealed. *Notes and Queries*, 47.2, June 2000. pp.188–9.

Bearman, Robert (2002). "Was William Shakespeare William Shakeshafte?" Revisited. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 53.1. pp.83–94.

Bearman, Robert (2003). John Shakespeare's "Spiritual Testament": A Reappraisal. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 56. pp.184–204.

Bearman, Robert (2005). John Shakespeare: A Papist or Just Penniless? *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 56.4. pp.411–33.

Beaumont, Francis and Fletcher, John (2004). *Philaster, or Love Lies a-Bleeding.* Gurr, Andrew (ed.).

Bednarz, James P. (2001). *Shakespeare and the Poets' War.*

Bellot, Hugh H. L. (1902). *The Inner And Middle Temple: Legal, Literary And Historic Associations.*

Bentley, Gerald Eades (1941). *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage.* Vol. 2.

Bentley, Gerald Eades (1948). Shakespeare and the Blackfriars Theatre. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 1. pp.38–50.

Berry, Herbert (1999). The Date on the 'Peacham' Manuscript. *Shakespeare Bulletin*, Vol. 17. pp.5–6.

Berry, Herbert (2002). Playhouses. In: Kinney, Arthur F. (ed.). *A Companion to Renaissance Drama.* pp.147–62.

Bertram, Paul (1961). The Date of The Two Noble Kinsmen. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 12.1, Winter 1961. pp.21–32.

Bhattacharyya, Jibesh (2006). *William Shakespeare's Othello.*

Billington, Sandra (1998). Was Timon of Athens Performed Before 1604? *Notes and Queries*, 45.3. September 1998. pp.351–3.

Blackburn, Thomas H. (1966). The Date and Evolution of Edmund Bolton's

"Hypercritica". *Studies in Philology*, 63.2. pp.196–202.

Blakemore Evans, Gwynne (ed.) (1997). *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd edition, Vol. 1.

Blayney, Peter W. M. (1991). *The First Folio of Shakespeare*.

Borukhov, Boris (2006). 'The Phoenix and the Turtle' was Published in 1601. *Notes and Queries*, 53.1, March 2006. pp.71–2.

Boswell Jr., James (1821). *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*. Vol. 15.

Bowers, Fredson (ed.) (1980). *Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries to Texts in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*.

Bowers, Rick (2005). James VI, Prince Henry, and A True Reportarie of Baptism at Stirling 1594. *Renaissance and Reformation*, 29.4. pp.3–22.

Boyd, Brian (2004). Words That Count: Introduction. In: Boyd, Brian (ed.). *Words That Count: Essays on Early Modern Authorship in Honor of MacDonald P. Jackson*. pp.15–28.

Bradbrook, Muriel Clara (1978). *Shakespeare*.

Bradby, Anne (2004). *Shakespeare Criticism*.

Braines, William Westmoreland (1924). *The Site of the Globe Playhouse Southwark*.

Braunmuller, A. R. and Hattaway, Michael (2003). *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama*.

Brinkworth, E. R. C. (1972). *Shakespeare and the Bawdy Court of Stratford*.

Brooke, Tucker (1926). *Shakespeare of Stratford*.

Brown, Basil (1921). *Law Sports at Gray's Inn (1594)*.

Bruce, J. (ed.) (1868). *John Manningham: Diary, 1602–1603*.

Bruster, Douglas (2003). *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture*.

Burke, John (1844). *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies of England, Ireland, and Scotland*. 2nd edition.

Burke, Sir Bernard (1866). *A Genealogical History of the Dormant, Abeyant, Forfeited, and Extinct Peerages of the British Empire*.

Burkhart, Robert E. (1975). *Shakespeare's Bad Quartos*.

Burrow, Colin (ed.) (2002). *The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Sonnets and Poems*.

Butler, Martin, et al. (eds.) (1989). *The Selected Plays of Ben Jonson*. Vol. 2.

C

Campbell, Julie D. (2006). *Literary Circles and Gender in Early Modern Europe.*

Carroll, William C. (1996). *Fat King, Lean Beggar: Representations of Poverty in the Age of Shakespeare.*

Cathcart, Charles (2008). *Marston, Rivalry, Rapprochement, and Jonson.*

Celeste Turner Wright, Julia (1959). Young Anthony Munday Again. *Studies in Philology*, 56.2. pp.150–68.

Centerwall, Brandon S. (2006). Who Wrote William Basse's 'Elegy on Shakespeare'?: Rediscovering a Poem Lost from the Donne Canon. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 59. pp.267–84.

Cerasano, Susan P. (1998). Women as Theatrical Investors. In: Cerasano, Susan P. and Wynne-Davies, Marion (eds.). *Readings in Renaissance Women's Drama*. pp.87–94.

Cerasano, Susan P. (2005). *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*. Vol. 18.

Chainey, Graham (1995). *A Literary History of Cambridge.*

Chambers, E. K. (1944). *Shakespearean Gleanings.*

Chambrun, Clara Longworth (1957). *Shakespeare: a Portrait Restored.*

Charnaik, Warren (2011). *The Myth of Rome in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries.*

Cheney, Patrick Gerard (2007). *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare's Poetry.*

Clark, Alice (1968). *The Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century.*

Clegg, Cyndia Susan (2008). King Lear and Early Seventeenth-Century Print Culture. In: Kahan, Jeffrey (ed.). *King Lear: New Critical Essays*. pp.155–83.

Collier, John Payne (1844). The new Fact regarding Shakespeare and his Wife, contained in the Will of Thomas Whittington. *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, Vol. 3. pp.127–30.

Collier, John Payne (1853a). *Lives of the Original Actors in Shakespeare's Plays.*

Collier, John Payne (1853b). *The Works of Shakespeare*. Vol. 1.

Collier, John Payne (1858). *Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, Tragedies, and Poems.*

Cook, David (ed.) (1961). *Collections, Volume VI*. Malone Society Collections, Vol. 6.

Cooper, C. P. (1832). *An Account of the Most Important Public Records of Great Britain*. Vol. 1.

Cooper, Tarnya (ed.) (2006). *Searching for Shakespeare.*

Couchman, Jane and Crabb, Ann (2005) *Women's Letters Across Europe, 1400–1700.*

Crewe, Jonathan (2003). Henry IV, Part 2: A Critical History. In: Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (eds.). *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works*. pp.432–50.

D

De Groot, John Henry (1946). *The Shakespeares and "The Old Faith"*.

De Quincey, Thomas (1842). Shakespeare. In: the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Vol. 20. 7th edition.

De Quincey, Thomas (1851). *Biographical Essays*.

Dillon, Janette (2007). *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies*.

Dixon, W. Macneile and Smart, John Semple (1929). *Shakespeare Truth and Tradition*.

Dobranski, Stephen B. (2005). *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England*.

Dobson, Michael and Wells, Stanley W. (2001). *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*.

Dolven, Jeffrey Andrew (2007). *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance*.

Dover Wilson, John (1952). Review of The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, Why, and How it was Written by Shakespeare. *Review of English Studies*, 3.12. pp.386–8.

Drayton, Michael (1627). *The Battaile of Agincourt*. EEBO, STC 7190.

Duncan-Jones (2001). *Ungentle Shakespeare*.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine (1993). Much Ado with Red and White. *Review of English Studies*, 44.176. pp.479–501.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine (2001). *Ungentle Shakespeare*.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine (2010). *The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Sonnets*.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine and Woudhuysen, H. R. (2007). *The Arden Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Poems*.

Dusinberre, Juliet (1993). The Taming of the Shrew: Women, Acting, and Power. *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Vol. 26. pp.67–84.

Dusinberre, Juliet (2004). Pancakes and a Date for As You Like It. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 54.4. pp.371–405.

Duthie, George Ian (1941). *The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet: a Critical Study*.

Dutton, Richard (2009). *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*.

Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (2003). *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works*. Vol. 2.

E

Edmond, Mary (1974). Pembroke's Men. *Review of English Studies*, Vol. 25. pp.129–36.

Edmond, Mary (1993). Peter Street, 1553–1609: Builder of Playhouses. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 45. pp.101–14.

Edmond, Mary (2004). Burbage, Richard (1568–1619). In: *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, September 2004; accessed online, January 2008.

Edmondson, Paul and Wells, Stanley (2004). *The Oxford Shakespeare: Shakespeare's Sonnets.*

Edward Stanford Ltd. (1959). *City of London.* Showing Parish Boundaries Prior to Union of Parishes Act of 1907. Reproduction map.

Edwards, Philip (1959). *The Spanish Tragedy.*

Egan, Gabriel (2000). Review of Shakespeare's Mystery Play. *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 5.3. Sections 9.1–10.

Ellis-Fermor, Una (1942). Timon of Athens: an Unfinished Play. *Review of English Studies*, Vol. 18. pp.270–83.

Elton, Charles Isaac (1904). *William Shakespeare: His Family and Friends.*

Erne, Lukas (2001). *Beyond the Spanish Tragedy: a Study of the Works of Thomas Kyd.*

Erne, Lukas (2002). Shakespeare and the Publication of His Plays. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 53.1. pp.1–20.

Erne, Lukas (2003). *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist.*

F

Fiehler, Rudolph (1955). How Oldcastle Became Falstaff. *Modern Language Quarterly*, Vol. 16. March 1955. pp.16–28.

Finlay, Roger (1981). *Population and metropolis: the demography of London 1580–1650.*

Fleay, Frederick (1876). *Shakespeare Manual.*

Foakes, R. A. (1985). *Illustrations of the English Stage, 1580–1642.*

Foakes, R. A. (ed.) (2002). *Henslowe's Diary.*

Foley, John Miles (2005). *A Companion to Ancient Epic.*

Foster, Donald W. (1999). "The gift is small, / The will is all". In: Halio, Jay L., et al. (eds.). *Shakespeare: Text and Theater.* pp.92–106.

Fox, Levi (1977). Diary of Robert Beake, Mayor of Coventry, 1655–1656. In:

Bearman, Robert (ed.). *Dugdale Miscellany I*, Vol. 31 of the Publications of the Dugdale Society. pp.118–25.

Freeman, Arthur, and Freeman, Janet Ing (2004). *John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century.*

French, George Russell (1869). *Shakspeareana Genealogica: Part I.*

Fripp, Edgar Innes (1920). Among the Shakespeare Archives. *Notes and Queries*, 12.7. pp.342–3.

Fripp, Edgar Innes (1924). *Master Richard Quyny.*

Fripp, Edgar Innes (1928). *Shakespeare's Stratford.*

Fripp, Edgar Innes (1929). *Shakespeare's Haunts near Stratford.*

Fripp, Edgar Innes (1930). *Shakespeare Studies, Biographical and Literary.*

Fryde, E. B., et al. (1986). *The Handbook of British Chronology.*

Fullom, Stephen Watson (1864). *History of William Shakespeare, Player and Poet.*

Furnivall, Frederick James and Munro, John James (1910). *Shakespeare; Life and Work.*

G

Gaines, Barry and Maurer, Margaret (2010). *Three Shrew Plays.*

Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser (1770). "*This day is published*". Issue 12,818, 31st March 1770.

Geckle, George L. (1980). *John Marston's Drama.*

George, David (2000). Plutarch, Insurrection, and Dearth. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 53. pp.60–72.

Gibson, James M. (2002). *Kent: Diocese of Canterbury.* Records of Early English Drama. Vol. 2, Records.

Gillespie, Stuart (2004). *Shakespeare's Books: a Dictionary of Shakespeare Sources.*

Goldberg, Jonathan (1989). *James the First and the Politics of Literature.*

Goodman, Godfrey (1839). *The Court of King James the First.*

Gosse, Edmund (ed.) (1899). *The Life and Letters of John Donne.* Vol. 2.

Gossett, Suzanne (2003). "You not your child well loving": Text and Family Structure in Pericles. In: Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (eds.). *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works.* Vol. 4. pp.348–64.

Gossett, Suzanne (2007). Taking Pericles Seriously. In: Lyne, Raphael and Mukherji,

Subha (eds.). *Early Modern Tragicomedy*. pp.101–14.

Gower, John (1635). *Pyrgomachia*. EEBO, STC 12141.

Goy-Blanquet, Dominique (2003). *Shakespeare's Early History Plays: From Chronicle to Stage*.

Grafton, Anthony, Most, Glenn W., and Settis, Salvatore (2010). *The Classical Tradition*.

Gray, Henry David (1941a). Shakespeare, Southampton and Avisa. *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*. pp.143–51.

Gray, Henry David (1941b). The Taming of A Shrew. In: Maxwell, Baldwin, et al. (eds.). *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig*. pp.133–41.

Gray, Joseph William (1905). *Shakespeare's Marriage*.

Greenblatt, Stephen (2004). *Will in the World*.

Greenblatt, Stephen, et al. (eds.) (2008). *The Norton Shakespeare*.

Greene, Guy Shepard (1924). A New Date for George Wilkins's Three Miseries of Barbary. *Modern Language Notes*, 39.5. pp.285–291.

Greer, Germaine (2007). *Shakespeare's Wife*.

Greg, W. W. (ed.) (1908). *Collections, Part II*. Malone Society Collections, 1.2.

Greg, W. W. (ed.) (1909). *Collections, Part III*. Malone Society Collections, 1.3.

Greg, W. W. (ed.) (1911). *Collections, Parts IV & V*. Malone Society Collections, 1.4 & 1.5.

Grosart, Alexander Balloch (1876). *The Complete Poems of Sir John Davies*.

Grote, David (2002). *The Best Actors in the World*.

Gurr, Andrew (1999). Maximal and Minimal Texts: Shakespeare v. The Globe. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 52. pp.68–87.

Gurr, Andrew (2004a). *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*.

Gurr, Andrew (2004b). The Great Divide of 1594. In: Boyd, Brian (ed.). *Words That Count: Essays on Early Modern Authorship in Honor of MacDonald P. Jackson*. pp.29–50.

Gurr, Andrew (2004c). *The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642*.

H

Hadfield, Andrew (2005). *Shakespeare and Republicanism*.

Hager, Alan (2004). *The Age of Milton*.

Haley, David (1993). *Shakespeare's Courtly Mirror*.

Hall, Joan Lord (2005). *The Winter's Tale: a Guide to the Play*.

Halliday, F. E. (1952). *A Shakespeare Companion*.

Halliwell, James Orchard (1843). *The First Sketches of the Second and Third Parts of King Henry the Sixth.*

Halliwell, James Orchard (1848). *The Life of William Shakespeare.*

Halliwell, James Orchard (1864). *An Historical Account of the New Place.*

Halliwell-Phillipps, James Orchard (1888). *New Evidences in Confirmation of the Traditional Recognition of Shakespeare's Birth-Room.*

Hamel, Guy (1989). King John and The Troublesome Raigne: A Reexamination. In: Curren-Aquino, Deborah T. (ed.). *King John: New Perspectives.* pp.41–61.

Hammer, Paul E. J. (2008). Shakespeare's Richard II, the Play of 7 February 1601, and the Essex Rising. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59.1. pp.1–35.

Hanley, Hugh H. (1964). Shakespeare's Family in Stratford Records. *Times Literary Supplement*, 21st May. p.441.

Harrison, G. B. (1930). Keep the Widow Waking. *Library*, Series 4, 9.1. pp.97–101.

Harrison, Thomas P. (1966). Review of The Phoenix and the Turtle: Shakespeare's Poem and Chester's Loues Martyr by William H. Matchett. *Modern Philology*, 64.2, November. pp.155–7.

Hart, Alfred (1932). The Number of Lines in Shakespeare's Plays. *Review of English Studies*, 8.29. pp.19–28.

Heaton, Gabriel (2010). *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments.*

Heffner, Linda J. (2004). Advanced Maternal Age — How Old Is Too Old? *The New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 351. pp.1927–29.

Helgerson, Richard (1994). *Forms of Nationhood.*

Hibbard, G. R. (ed.) (1995). *Four Comedies.*

Hill, Frank Ernest (1970). *To Meet Will Shakespeare.*

Holmer, Joan Ozark (1994). "Draw, if you be Men": Saviolo's Significance for Romeo and Juliet. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 45.2, Summer. pp.163–189.

Honan, Park (2005). *Christopher Marlowe: Poet & Spy.*

Honigmann, E. A. J. (1956). The Date of Hamlet. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 9. pp.24-34.

Honigmann, E. A. J. (1965). *The Stability of Shakespeare's Text.*

Honigmann, E. A. J. (1987). *John Weever.*

Honigmann, E. A. J. (1988). "There Is a World Elsewhere": William Shakespeare, Businessman. In: Habicht, Werner and Palmer, David John (eds.). *Images of Shakespeare.* pp.40–6.

Honigmann, E. A. J. (1993). The First Quarto of Hamlet and the Date of Othello. *Review of English Studies*, New Series, 44.174. pp.211–9.

Honigmann, E. A. J. (1996). *The Texts of Othello and Shakespearian Revision.*

Honigmann, E. A. J. (1998). *Shakespeare: The Lost Years.*

Honigmann, E. A. J. (2003). The Shakespeare/Shakeshafte Question, Continued. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 54.1. pp.83–6.

Honigmann, E. A. J. and Brock, Susan (1993). *Playhouse Wills, 1558–1642.*

Hoole, Charles (1661). *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole.* EEBO, Wing H2688.

Hope, Jonathan (1994). *The Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays.*

Hornback, Robert B. (2004). *The Fool in Quarto and Folio King Lear.* In English Literary Renaissance, 34.3.

Horne, David Hamilton (1952). *The Life and Minor Works of George Peele.*

Hosley, Richard (1980). *Oberon, the Fairy Prince, by Ben Jonson.* Wells, Stanley, Spencer, T. J. B., and Nicoll, Allardyce (eds.).

Hotson, Leslie (1931). *Shakespeare versus Shallow.*

Hotson, Leslie (1938). *I, William Shakespeare.*

Hotson, Leslie (1949). *Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated.*

Hudson, Henry Norman (1852). *The Works of Shakespeare.* Vol. 5.

Hunt, Maurice (2002). Romance and Tragicomedy. In: Kinney, Arthur F. (ed.). *A Companion to Renaissance Drama.* pp.384–98.

Hunter, Joseph (1845). *New Illustrations of the Life, Studies, and Writings of Shakespeare.*

Hyland, Peter (2003). *An Introduction to Shakespeare's Poems.*

I

Ingleby, Clement Mansfield (1909). *The Shakspere Allusion-book.*

Ioppolo, Grace (1991). *Revising Shakespeare.*

J

Jackson, MacDonald P. (1990). The Year's Contributions to Shakespeare Studies: Editions and Textual Studies. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 42. pp.200–14.

Jackson, MacDonald P. (2003). *Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case.*

Janik, Vicki K. (2003). *The Merchant of Venice: a Guide to the Play.*

Jeaffreson, John Cordy (ed.) (1892). Sir Baptist Hicks. *Middlesex County Records*. Vol. 4. pp.329–49.

Jenkins, Harold (1935). On the Authenticity of Greene's Groatsworth of Wit and The Repentance of Robert Greene. *Review of English Studies*, 11.41. pp.28–41.

Jenkins, Keith and Munslow, Alun (2003). *Re-Thinking History.*

Johnson, Samuel (1786). *The Dramatick Writings of Will. Shakespeare*. Vol. 2.

Jones, G. P. (1978). Henry V: The Chorus and the Audience. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 31. pp.93–104.

Jones, Jeanne E. (1994). Lewis Hiccox and Shakespeare's Birthplace. *Notes and Queries*, 41.4, December 1994. pp.497–502.

Jones, John (1995). *Shakespeare at Work.*

Jonson, Ben (1627). *The Vision of Ben Ionson.* In Drayton, Michael (1627). The Battaile of Agincourt. EEBO, STC 7190.

Jonson, Ben (1641). *The workes of Beniamin Ionson.* EEBO, STC 14754.

Jonson, Ben (1990). *Sejanus his Fall.* Ayres, Philip J. (ed.).

Jonson, Ben (2001). *Every Man Out of His Humour.* Ostovich, Helen (ed.).

Joseph, Harriet (1976). *John Hall: Man and Physician.*

Jowett, John (1993). Johannes Factotum: Henry Chettle and Greene's Groatsworth of Wit. *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 87.4. pp.453–86.

Jowett, John (2003a). Henry Chettle: 'Your old Compositor'. *Text*, Vol. 15. pp.141–61.

Jowett, John (2003b). The Year's Contributions to Shakespeare Studies: Editions and Textual Studies. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 50. pp.267–90.

Jowett, John (2007). *Shakespeare and Text.*

Jowitt, Claire (2010). *The Culture of Piracy, 1580–1630.*

K

Kahn, Coppélia (1981). *Man's Estate.*

Kastan, David Scott (2006). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature*. Vol. 1.

Kay, Dennis (1992). *Shakespeare: His Life, Work and Era.*

Keene, D. J. and Harding, Vanessa (1987). *Historical Gazetteer of London Before the Great Fire:*

Cheapside; parishes of All Hallows Honey Lane, St Martin Pomary, St Mary le Bow, St Mary Colechurch and St Pancras Soper Lane.

Kiefer, Frederick (2003). *Shakespeare's Visual Theatre.*

Kimbrough, Robert (1962). The Origins of Troilus and Cressida. *The Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 77.3. pp.194–9.

King, Ros (2005). *Cymbeline: Constructions of Britain.*

Kinney, Arthur F. (2001). *Lies Like Truth: Shakespeare, Macbeth, and the Cultural Moment.*

Kinney, Arthur F. (2003). *Shakespeare by Stages: an Historical Introduction.*

Kirschbaum, Leo (1937). The Date of Shakespeare's Hamlet. *Studies in Philology*, 34. pp.168–75.

Kirschbaum, Leo (1955). *Shakespeare and the Stationers.*

Knafla, Louis A. (2004). Hoby, Sir Edward (1560–1617). In: *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. pp.436–9.

Knight, Charles (1839). *The Routledge Pictorial Edition of the Works of W. Shakespeare*. Vol. 1, Histories.

Knight, Charles (1854). *The Stratford Shakspere*. Vol. 1.

Knowles, Richard (2003). How Shakespeare Knew King Leir. In: Holland, Peter (ed.). *King Lear and its Afterlife*. pp.12–35.

Knutson, Roslyn L. (1983). Henslowe's Naming of Parts. *Notes and Queries*, 228. pp.157–60.

Knutson, Roslyn L. (2002). Two Playhouses, Both Alike in Dignity. *Shakespeare Studies*, 30. pp.111–7.

Kyd, Thomas (2009). *The Spanish Tragedy.* Gurr, Andrew and Mulryne, J. R. (eds.).

L

Laing, David (ed.) (1842). *Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden.*

Lamb, Mary Ellen (1985). The Nature of Topicality in 'Love's Labour's Lost'. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 38. pp.49–60.

Lamborn, E. A. G. and Harrison, G. B. (1924). *Shakespeare: The Man and his Stage.*

Lambrechts, Guy (1967). Sur Deux Prétendues Sources de Richard II. *Etudes Anglaises*, Vol. 20. pp.118–39.

Lancashire, Ian (1980). *Annotated Bibliography of Printed Records of Early British Drama and Minstrelsy for 1978–9*. Records of Early English Drama.

Leach, Arthur Francis (1911). *Educational Charters and Documents 598 to 1909*.

Lee, Sidney (1904). *Stratford-on-Avon: From the Earliest Times to the Death of Shakespeare*.

Lee, Sidney (1916). *A Life of William Shakespeare*. 1st edition.

Lee, Sidney (1925). *A Life of William Shakespeare*. 4th edition.

Leeds Barroll, J. (1991). *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theater*.

Lesser, Zachary (2004). *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication*.

Lewis, Benjamin Roland (1969). *The Shakespeare Documents*.

Lloyd, William Watkiss (1875). *Critical Essays on the Plays of Shakespeare*.

Logan, M. George (1976). Lucan-Daniel-Shakespeare: New Light on the Relation between The Civil Wars and Richard II. *Shakespeare Studies*, Vol. 9. pp.121–40.

Louis, Cameron (2000). *Sussex*. Records of Early English Drama.

Love, Ronald S. (2001). *Blood and Religion: The Conscience of Henri IV, 1553–1593*.

Lynch, Stephen J. (2003). *As You Like It: a Guide to the Play*.

Lyon, John Henry Hobart (1919). *A study of The newe Metamorphosis written by J. M., gent, 1600*.

M

Macdonald, Mairi (2009). Pers. comm., 21st April 2009.

Maguire, Laurie E. (1996). *Shakespearean Suspect Texts*.

Malone, Edmond (1790). *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*.

Malone, Edmond (1796). *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of Certain Miscellaneous Papers and Legal Instruments*.

Malone, Edmond (1808). *An Account of the Incidents from which the Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest were Derived*.

Malone, Edmond (1821). *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*. Boswell Jr., James (ed.).

Manley, Lawrence (2003). From Strange's Men to Pembroke's Men: 2 Henry VI and The First part of the Contention. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 54.3. pp.253–87.

Marchitello, Howard (2007). Finding Cardenio. *English Literary History*, 74.4. pp.957–89.

Marino, James M. (2009). The Anachronistic Shrews. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 60.1. pp.25–46.

Marston, John (2005). *Antonio and Mellida*. Gair, W. Reavley (ed.).

Martin, Charles Trice (1910). *The Record Interpreter: A collection of abbreviations, Latin words and names used in English historical manuscripts and records.*

Martin, Peter (1995). *Edmond Malone, Shakespearean Scholar: A Literary Biography.*

Marwick, Arthur (1970). *The Nature of History.*

Massai, Sonia (2007). *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor.*

McCoy, Richard C. (2003). Shakespearean Tragedy and Religious Identity. In: Dutton, Richard and Howard, Jean Elizabeth (eds.). *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works*. Vol. 1. pp.178–98.

McCulloch, Gary (2004). *Documentary Research: In Education, History and the Social Sciences.*

McManaway, James G. (1949). The Year's Contributions to Shakespearian Study: Textual Studies. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 2. pp.145–53.

McMillin, Scott and MacLean, Sally-Beth (1998). *The Queen's Men and their Plays.*

McMullan, Gordon (2007). *Shakespeare and the Idea of Late Writing.*

Menken, Jane, et al. (1986). Age and Infertility. *Science*, 233.4771. September 1986. pp.1389–94.

Metz, G. Harold (1985). Titus Andronicus: A Watermark in the Longleat Manuscript. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 36.4. pp.450–3.

Metz, G. Harold (2009). Voice and Credyt: the Scholars and Sir Thomas More. *Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More*, ed. T. H. Howard-Hill. pp.11–44.

Metz, George Harold (1989). *Sources of Four Plays Ascribed to Shakespeare.*

Mitchell, Reg (2007). *Tho: Quiney - Gent.*

Montgomery, Roy F. (1954). A Fair House Built on Another Man's Ground. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 5.2. pp.207–8.

Montrose, Louis Adrian (1996). *The Purpose of Playing.*

Muir, Kenneth (1953). Holland's Pliny and Othello. *Notes and Queries*, Vol. 198. pp.513–4.

Murphy, Andrew (2003). *Shakespeare in Print: a History and Chronology of Shakespeare Publishing.*

Murray, John Tucker (1910). *English Dramatic Companies, 1558–1642*. Vol. 1.

Mutschmannm, Heinrich and Wentersdorf, Karl P. (1952). *Shakespeare and Catholicism.*

N

Nelson, Alan H. (1998a). Calling All (Shakespeare) Biographers! Or, a Plea for Documentary Discipline. In: Kozuka, Takashi and Mulryne, J. R. (eds.). *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson*. pp.55–68.

Nelson, Alan H. (1998b). George Buc, William Shakespeare, and the Folger George a Greene. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 49.1. pp.74–83.

Nicholl, Charles (2007). *The Lodger*.

Nicholls, Mark (1995). Two Winchester Trials: the Prosecution of Henry, Lord Cobham, and Thomas, Lord Grey of Wilton, 1603. *Historical Research*, 68.165; February. pp.26–48.

Nicholls, Mark (2005). Sir Walter Ralegh's Treason: a Prosecution Document. *The English Historical Review*, 110.438. pp.902–924.

Nicholls, Mark and Williams, Penry (2011). *Sir Walter Raleigh: in Life and Legend*.

O

Orme, Nicholas (2006). *Medieval Schools*.

Ornstein, Robert (1994). *Shakespeare's Comedies*.

Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.). "at game", P1; in "game", n.

P

Parr, Anthony (ed.) (1995). *Three Renaissance Travel Plays*.

Parry, Graham (1981). *The Golden Age Restor'd: the Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42*.

Pearce, Joseph (2008). *The Quest for Shakespeare*.

Phelps, Wayne H. (1978). Edmund Shakespeare at St. Leonard's, Shoreditch. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 29.3. pp.422–3.

Phillips, O. Hood (1972). *Shakespeare and the Lawyers*.

Piccope, G. J. (1860). *Lancashire and Cheshire Wills and Inventories*. 2nd portion.

Pope, Alexander (1726). *The Works of Shakespear*. Vol. 7.

Price, Diana (1997). Reconsidering Shakespeare's Monument. *Review of English Studies*, 48.190. pp.168–82.

Proudfoot, Richard, Thompson, Ann, and Kastan, David Scott (2001). *The Arden Shakespeare: Complete Works.*

Pryor, Felix (2003). *Elizabeth I: Her Life in Letters.*

Public Record Office (1964). *Shakespeare in the Public Records.*

Pujante, A. Luis (1998). Double Falsehood and the Verbal Parallels with Shelton's Don Quixote. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 51. pp.95–105.

Purchas, Samuel (1625). *Purchas His Pilgrimes.* EEBO, STC 20509.

R

Raffield, Paul (2004). *Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England.*

Ribner, Irving (2005). *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare.*

Rice, Douglas Walthew (2005). *The Life and Achievements of Sir John Popham, 1531–1607.*

Riggs, David (1989). *Ben Jonson: A Life.*

Ripley, John (1998). *Coriolanus on stage in England and America, 1609–1994.*

Ritson, Joseph (1809). *The Jurisdiction of the Court Leet.*

Roach, Joseph R. (1985). *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting.*

Robertson, J. M. (1905). *Did Shakespeare Write "Titus Andronicus"?*

Robertson, J. M. (1922). *Shakespeare Canon.*

Rogers, H. L. (1965). An English Tailor and Father Garnet's Straw. *Review of English Studies*, 16.61. pp.44–9.

Rooney, Tom (2008). (Re)Presenting Shakespeare's Co-Authors: Lessons from the Oxford Shakespeare. In: Bradshaw, Graham and Bishop, Tom (eds.). *The Shakespearean International Yearbook*, Vol. 8. pp.219–37.

Ross, Lawrence J. (1997). *Measure for Measure: an Essay in Criticism of Shakespeare's Drama.*

Rowe, Nicholas (ed.) (1709). *The Works of Mr. William Shakespear.* Vol. 1.

Rutter, Carol Chillington (1999). *Documents of the Rose Playhouse.*

S

Sampson, George and Church, Reginald C. (1972). *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature.*

Sanders, Chauncey (1933). Robert Greene and His "Editors". *The Publications of the*

Modern Language Association, 48.2. pp.392–417.

Saunders, H. W. (ed.) (1915). *The Official Papers of Nathanial Bacon.*

Savage, Richard (1905). *The Registers of Stratford-on-Avon in the County of Warwick*. Vol. 3, Burials 1558–1622-3. Parish Register Society.

Savage, Richard (1910). *Shakespearean Extracts from Edward Pudsey's Booke.*

Schanzer, Ernest (1956). Thomas Platter's Observations on the Elizabethan Stage. *Notes and Queries*, 3.11. pp.465–7.

Schoenbaum, S. (1991). *Shakespeare's Lives.*

Schoenfeldt, Michael (2010). *The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare's Poetry.*

Schoone-Jongen, Terence (2008). *Shakespeare's Companies.*

Scott-Warren, Jason (2013). Was Elizabeth I Richard II?: The Authenticity of Lambarde's 'Conversation'. *Review of English Studies*, 64.264. pp.208–30.

Scouten, Arthur Hawley (1997). *Lear from Study to Stage.*

Severn, Charles (ed.) (1839). *Diary of the Rev. John Ward, A.* M.

Shakespeare, William (1687). *Titus Andronicus*. Ravenscroft, Edward (ed.). EEBO, Wing S2949.

Shakespeare, William (1890). *As You Like It*. Furness, Horace Howard (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 8.

Shakespeare, William (1898). *The Winter's Tale*. Furness, Horace Howard (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 11.

Shakespeare, William (1913). *The Tragedie of Cymbeline*. Furness, Horace Howard (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 18.

Shakespeare, William (1940). *The Second Part of Henry the Fourth*. Vol. 23, Part 2. Shaaber, Matthias A. (ed.), Lippincott Variorum.

Shakespeare, William (1952). *The First Part of King Henry VI*. Dover Wilson, John (ed.), Cambridge.

Shakespeare, William (1955). *The Life and Death of King Richard II*. Black, Matthew W. (ed.), New Variorum, Vol. 27.

Shakespeare, William (1960). *King Henry IV Part 2*. Humphreys, A. R. (ed.), Arden.

Shakespeare, William (1968a). *Love's Labour's Lost*. David, Richard (ed.), Arden.

Shakespeare, William (1968b). *The Tempest*. Righter, Anne (ed.), Penguin.

Shakespeare, William (1971). *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Oliver, H. J. (ed.), Arden.

Shakespeare, William (1973). *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Hibbard, George R. (ed.),

Penguin.
Shakespeare, William (1979). *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Brooks, Harold F. (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (1982a). *Hamlet*. Jenkins, Harold (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (1982b). *The Taming of the Shrew*. Oliver, H. J. (ed.), Oxford.
Shakespeare, William (1991). *The Second Part of King Henry VI*. Hattaway, Michael (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (1994). *Henry V*. Taylor, Gary (ed.), Oxford.
Shakespeare, William (1995). *Antony and Cleopatra*. Wilders, John (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (1997). *Macbeth*. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), New Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (1998a). *Julius Caesar*. Daniell, David (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (1998b). *Love's Labour's Lost*. Woudhuysen, H. R. (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (1998c). *The First Quarto of Hamlet*. Irace, Kathleen O. (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (1998d). *The Taming of a Shrew: The 1594 Quarto*. Miller, Stephen Roy (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (1998e). *Troilus and Cressida*. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (1999). *The Tempest*. Vaughan, Alden T. and Vaughan, Virginia Mason (eds.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2000). *King Henry VIII: All is True*. McMullan, Gordon (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2001a). *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Gill, Roma (ed.), Oxford School Shakespeare.
Shakespeare, William (2001b). *Henry V*. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios.
Shakespeare, William (2001c). *Henry VI, Part Three*. Martin, Randall (ed.), Oxford.
Shakespeare, William (2001d). *The First Quarto of Othello*. McMillin, Scott (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2002a). *Cymbeline*. Nosworthy, J. M. (ed.), Cengage.
Shakespeare, William (2002b). *King Henry IV: Part 1*. Kastan, David Scott (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2002c). *King Richard II*. Forker, Charles R. (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2002d). *The Taming of the Shrew*. Morris, Brian (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2002e). *Titus Andronicus*. Waith, Eugene M. (ed.), Oxford.
Shakespeare, William (2003a). *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Foakes, R. A. (ed.), Cambridge.

Shakespeare, William (2003b). *All's Well That Ends Well*. Fraser, Russell (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2003c). *As You Like It*. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios.
Shakespeare, William (2003d). *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. Edwards, Philip (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2003e). *Macbeth*. De Somogyi, Nick (ed.), Shakespeare Folios.
Shakespeare, William (2003f). *Much Ado About Nothing*. Mares, F. H. (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2003g). *Richard II*. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2003h). *The Comedy of Errors*. Charles Whitworth (ed.), Oxford.
Shakespeare, William (2003i). *The Taming of the Shrew*. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2003j). *Titus Andronicus*. Bate, Jonathan (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2004a). *Henry VI, Part One*. Taylor, Michael (ed.), Oxford.
Shakespeare, William (2004b). *Julius Caesar*. Spevak, Marvin (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2004c). *Pericles*. Gossett, Suzanne (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2004d). *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Carroll, William C. (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2005a). *Antony and Cleopatra*. Bevington, David M. (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2005b). *Hamlet*. Thompson, Ann (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2005c). *Julius Caesar*. Wiggins, Martin (ed.), Penguin.
Shakespeare, William (2005d). *King Henry V*. Gurr, Andrew (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2005e). *King Lear*. Halio, Jay L. (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2005f). *Macbeth*. Rutter, Carol Chillington (ed.), Penguin.
Shakespeare, William (2005g). *Much Ado About Nothing*. McEachern, Claire Elizabeth (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2005h). *The Tragedy of King Lear*. Halio, Jay L. (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2006a). *As You Like It*. Dusinberre, Juliet (ed.), Arden.
Shakespeare, William (2006b). *Measure for Measure*. Gibbons, Brian (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2006c). *Titus Andronicus*. Hughes, Alan (ed.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2007a). *The First Part of King Henry IV*. Weil, Herbert, and Weil, Judith (eds.), Cambridge.
Shakespeare, William (2007b). *The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*. Erne, Lukas (ed.),

Cambridge.

Shakespeare, William (2008a). *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Holland, Peter (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008b). *All's Well That Ends Well*. Snyder, Susan (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008c). *Antony and Cleopatra*. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008d). *As You Like It*. Brissenden, Alan (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008e). *Hamlet*. Hibbard, G. R. (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008f). *Julius Caesar*. Humphreys, Arthur (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008g). *King John*. Braunmuller, A. R. (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008h). *King Lear*. Wells, Stanley (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008i). *Macbeth*. Brooke, Nicholas (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008j). *Much Ado About Nothing*. Zitner, Sheldon P. (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008k). *Othello: The Moor of Venice*. Neill, Michael (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008l). *Pericles*. Giddens, Eugene (ed.), Penguin.

Shakespeare, William (2008m). *Pericles*. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008n). *The History of King Lear: The 1608 Quarto*. Wells, Stanley (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008o). *The Merchant of Venice*. Halio, Jay L. (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008p). *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Craik, T. W. (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008q). *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Warren, Roger (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008r). *Timon of Athens*. Jowett, John (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2008s). *Troilus and Cressida*. Muir, Kenneth (ed.), Oxford.

Shakespeare, William (2009a). *As You Like It*. Hattaway, Michael (ed.), Cambridge.

Shakespeare, William (2009b). *Richard III*. Siemon, James R. (ed.), Arden.

Shakespeare, William (2010a). *Coriolanus*. Bliss, Lee (ed.), Cambridge, 2nd edition.

Shakespeare, William (2010b). *The Winter's Tale*. Pitcher, John (ed.), Arden.

Shakespeare, William (2011c). *The Troublesome Reign of John, King of England*. Forker, Charles R. (ed.), Revels Plays.

Shakespeare, William (2011d). *The Winter's Tale*. Rhu, Lawrence F. (ed.), Evans Shakespeare.

Shakespeare, William and Fletcher, John (2002). *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Potter, Lois (ed.), Arden.

Shakespeare, William and Fletcher, John [Middleton, Thomas?] (1994). *Cardenio, or, the Second Maiden's Tragedy*. Hamilton, Charles (ed.).

Shakespeare, William and Middleton, Thomas (2008). *Timon of Athens*. Dawson, Anthony B. (ed.), Arden.

Shapiro, I. A. (1958). Richard II or Richard III or...? *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 9.2. pp.204–6.

Sidney, Philip (ed.) (1906). *Conversations of Ben Jonson with William Drummond of Hawthornden*.

Simpson, Robert (1852). *The History and Antuiquities of the Town of Lancaster*.

Singman, Jeffrey L. (1995). *Daily Life in Elizabethan England*.

Skempton, A. W. (2002). *A Biographical Dictionary of Civil Engineers in Great Britain and Ireland*.

Skura, Meredith Anne (2008). *Tudor Autobiography*.

Slater, Eliot (1988). *The Problem of the Reign of King Edward III*.

Smith, Bruce R. (2001). *Twelfth Night: Texts and Contexts*.

Snowden Ward, Henry (1896). *Shakespeare's Town and Times*.

Society of Antiquaries (1847). *Archaeologia*. Vol. 32.

Sohmer, Stephen T. (2007). *Shakespeare for the Wiser Sort*.

Sohmer, Steve (1997). 12 June 1599: Opening Day at Shakespeare's Globe. *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 3.1. Sections 1.1–46.

Sohmer, Steve (1999). *Shakespeare's Mystery Play*.

Sokol, B. J. (1994). *Art and Illusion in The Winter's Tale*.

Solomon, Deborah Cosier (2010). The Seventeenth-Century Timeline. In: Evans, Robert C. and Sterling, Eric J. (eds). *The Seventeenth-Century Literature Handbook*. pp.27–42.

Steible, Mary (2004). *Coriolanus: a Guide to the Play*.

Stern, Tiffany (2004). *Making Shakespeare*.

Stern, Tiffany (2012). 'Whether one did Contrive, the Other Write / Or one Fram'd the Plot the Other did Indite': Fletcher and Theobald as Collaborative Writers. In: Carnegie, David and Taylor, Gary (eds.). *The Quest for Cardenio: Shakespeare, Fletcher, Cervantes, and the Lost Play*. pp.115–32.

Stern, Virginia F. (1979). *Gabriel Harvey: his Life, Marginalia, and Library*.

Stevenson, Warren (2008). *Shakespeare's Additions to Thomas Kyd's "The Spanish Tragedy": A Fresh Look at the Evidence Regarding the 1602 Additions*.

Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1901). *Shakespeare's Family*.

Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1907). *Shakespeare's Warwickshire Contemporaries*.

Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1916). *Shakespeare's Industry*.

Stopes, Charlotte Carmichael (1969). *The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's*

Patron.

Stunz, Arthur N. (1942). The Date of Macbeth. *English Literary History*, 9.2. pp.95–105.

Surrey Archæological Society (1891). *Surrey Archæological Collections*. Vol. 10.

T

Taylor, Gary (1982). A New Source and an Old Date for King Lear. *Review of English Studies*, Vol. 33. pp.396–413.

Taylor, Gary (1995). Shakespeare and Others. *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, by Leeds Barroll (ed). pp.145–205.

Taylor, Gary (2009). The Date and Auspices of the Additions to Sir Thomas More. In: Howard-Hill, T. H. (ed.). *Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More*. pp.101–30.

Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008a). *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture*.

Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2008b). *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*.

Taylor, John (1630). *All the workes of Iohn Taylor the water-poet*. EEBO, STC 23725.

Taylor, Rupert (1945). Shakespeare's Cousin, Thomas Greene, and His Kin. *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 60.1. pp.81–94.

Terry, Richard G. (2001). *Poetry and the Making of the English Literary Past, 1660–1781*.

Theobald, Lewis [et al.?] (2010). *Double Falsehood*. Hammond, Brean (ed.), Arden.

Thomas, D. L. and Evans, N. E. (1984). John Shakespeare in The Exchequer. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 35.3. pp.315–8.

Thomas, Roy Digby (2001). *Digby: the Gunpowder Plotter's Legacy*.

Thomas, Sidney (1956). The Date of The Comedy of Errors. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 7. pp.377–84.

Thomas, Sidney (1988). On the Dating of Shakespeare's Early Plays. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 39.2. pp.187–94.

Thompson, Ann (1982). Dating Evidence for The Taming of the Shrew. *Notes and Queries*, 29.227. pp.108–9.

Thomson, Leslie (2010). Staging on the Road, 1586–1594: A New Look at Some Old Assumptions. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 61.4. pp.526–50.

Thomson, Peter (1992). *Shakespeare's Theatre*.

Thorndike, Ashley H. (1901). *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*.

Tillotson, Geoffrey (1933). Othello and The Alchemist at Oxford in 1610. *Times Literary Supplement*, 20th July 1933. p.494.

Tomarken, Edward (1997). *As You Like It from 1600 to the Present: Critical Essays.*

Townsend, George Henry (1867). *A Manual of Dates.*

Tumelson, Ronald A. II (2008). Robert Greene, "Author of Playes". In: Melnikoff, Kirk, et al. (eds.). *Writing Robert Greene*. pp.95–114.

Twigg, Graham (1993). Plague in London. In: Champion, Justin A. I. (ed.). *Epidemic Disease in London*. No. 1. pp.1–17.

U

Ungerer, Gustav (1961). An Unrecorded Elizabethan Performance of Titus Andronicus. *Shakespeare Survey*, Vol. 14. pp.102–9.

V

Van Es, Bart (2013). *Shakespeare in Company.*

Vaughan, Alden T. (2008). William Strachey's True Reportory and Shakespeare: A Closer Look at the Evidence. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 59.3. pp.245–73.

Vaughan, Alden T. and Vaughan, Virginia Mason (1999). *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History.*

Vickers, Brian (2004). *Shakespeare, Co-Author: a Historical Study of Five Collaborative Plays.*

Vickers, Brian (2004). The Troublesome Raigne, George Peele, and the Date of King John. In: Boyd, Brian (ed.). *Words That Count: Essays on Early Modern Authorship in Honor of MacDonald P. Jackson*. pp.78–116.

Vickers, Brian (2011). Shakespeare and Authorship Studies in the Twenty-First Century. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 62.1. pp.106–42.

Vitkus, Daniel J. (2000). *Three Turk Plays from Early Modern England.*

W

Wallace, Charles William (1910). Shakespeare and his London Associates. *University Studies of the University of Nebraska*, Vol. 10. pp.261–360.

Waller, Gary Fredric (2007). *All's Well That Ends Well: New Critical Essays.*

Ward, Henry Snowden (1896). *Shakespeare's Town and Times.*

Webb Wilcox, Reynold, et al. (1938). *Wilcoxson-Wilcox, Webb and Meigs families.*

Weir, Alison (2011). *Britain's Royal Families: the Complete Genealogy.*

Weis, René (2007). *Shakespeare Unbound.*

Weis, René (2008). *Shakespeare Revealed.*

Weiss, Adrian (2008). Father's Hubburd's Tales. In: Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.). *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture.* pp.348–9.

Wells, Stanley (1995). Flyleaf. In: the *Daily Telegraph*, 22nd April 1995. Section A8.

Wells, Stanley (2003). By the Placing of his Words. *Times Literary Supplement*. Issue 5243, 26th September 2003. pp.14–15.

Wells, Stanley (2003). *Shakespeare: For All Time.*

Wells, Stanley and Taylor, Gary (eds.) (2005). *The Oxford Shakespeare: William Shakespeare: The Complete Works.* 2nd edition.

Wells, Stanley, and Taylor, Gary (1997). *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion.*

Wentworth, Thomas (1668). *The Office and Duty of Executors.* EEBO, Wing W1361A.

West, Anthony James (2003). *The Shakespeare First Folio.* Vol. 2.

Wheler, Robert Bell (1814). *A Guide to Stratford-upon-Avon.*

White, Hayden (1995). *Response to Arthur Marwick.* In the Journal of Contemporary History. Vol. 30, No. 2.

Whitfield, Christopher (1964). Four Town Clerks of Stratford on Avon, 1603–1625. *Notes and Queries*, 11.7. pp.251–61.

Wickham, Glynne (1972). *Early English Stages, 1300 to 1660.* Vol. 2.

Wickham, Glynne, Berry, Herbert, and Ingram, William (eds.) (2000). *English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660.*

Wiggins, Martin (2000). *Shakespeare and the Drama of his Time.*

Wilkes, Thomas (1759). *A General View of the Stage.*

Wills, Garry (ed.) (1998). *Chapman's Homer: The Iliad.*

Wilson, Ian (1993). *Shakespeare: The Evidence.*

Wilson, Richard (2003). *Theatre and Religion.*

Wood, Michael (2003). *Shakespeare.*

Worcester, Thomas (1997). *Seventeenth-Century Cultural Discourse.*

Wyatt, Michael (2005). *The Italian Encounter with Tudor England.*
Wyndham, George (ed.) (1898). *The Poems of Shakespeare.*

Y

Yachnin, Paul (2006). Wonder-Effects: Othello's Handkerchief. In: Harris, Jonathan Gil and Korda, Natasha (eds.). *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama.* pp.316–34.
Youngs, Frederic A. (1976). *The Proclamations of the Tudor Queens.*

Z

Zupko, Ronald Edward (1985). *A Dictionary of Weights and Measures for the British Isles.*